The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 6, 1893.

The Week.

THE proclamation of the President convening Congress in extra session a little over a month hence, meets with universal approval. The new Congress ought to have assembled when the new President was inaugurated, just as all the Legislatures which were chosen on the day of the Presidential election began the discharge of their duties simultaneously with the incoming of the new Governors. Nevertheless, as things have turned out, it will undoubtedly be easier to secure right action on the financial question in August than it might have been in April, and the object-lessons which both our own country and India have furnished during the past four months were perhaps necessary to cure the victims of the silver craze. Meanwhile, the friends of sound money, without distinction of party, should devote all their efforts towards creating a public sentiment which will tolerate no more "fooling" with our financial system. What is needed is the repeal of the Sherman Act, without a substitution in its place of something else nearly as bad in the way of a "temporary expedient," as was done three years ago. One such experience as we have had with "temporary expedients" ought to suffice. We are glad to observe that the New York *Tribune* has seen light on this question. Not long ago it expressed doubt whether the "naked repeal" of the Sherman Act would be "for the best interests of the country," and whether the Republicans in Congress ought to help a Democratic President to bring it about. On Saturday, however, it changed its position and said: "The repeal of the act with which Senator Sherman's name is unfortunately associated is imperatively demanded. *It should be repealed unconditionally.*"

A good part of the soreness of Republicans over the present politico-financial situation is no doubt due to the remorseful consciousness that they threw away in 1890 a great opportunity for leadership and party success. When Speaker Reed was moving heaven and earth to "hang up" the Free-Coinage Bill in committee, and keep it at all hazards from going to a Presidential veto, he was really dooming his party to defeat. It is easy enough to see now that if he and the party leaders had boldly thrown down the gauntlet to the free-silver men, and had hailed the chance of a strong veto and a defiant campaign on the issue of honest money, they would have driven the halting Democrats into alliance with the silverites and into inevitable defeat. The Republican party seemed almost predestined for such a work as that; and if the old clear moral sense had not gone out of it, it is inconceivable that it would not have seized the opportunity of doing it. But the long years of jobbing and bargaining over the tariff and of seeking power through shrewd intrigue had done their fatal work, and so, instead of a bold and resolute attitude in which would have been safety and triumph, the best wisdom of the party could agree upon nothing better than that miserable dangling between the devil and the deep sea known as the Sherman Law. The chance for leadership which Republican cowardice and oversmartness threw away was seized by Mr. Cleveland in his letter to the Reform Club in February, 1891, pronouncing against free coinage. By that he not only saved his party from going to everlasting smash, but also put himself virtually at the head of the sound-money Republicans. They were forced to approve his course then, and they will be forced to vote in favor of his recommendations when Congress meets.

"Unwise" the President calls the Sherman Law in his proclamation. Immoral he might have called it, on the strength of confessions made by Congressman Walker of Massachusetts, who, in Saturday's *Tribune*, unblushingly unfolds a tale of political baseness almost unparalleled. He was a member of the conference committee which finally concocted the Sherman Law, and he admits that the Republicans were guilty of the most shameless betrayal of their constituents and their convictions. All but Jones were convinced, he now says, that, "aside from political considerations," the Sherman Law was "the most stupendous financial folly sane men ever engaged in." Of their conduct in engaging in it, nevertheless, he says, "The moralist may condemn this state of things as he will," and goes on to show how "the average Congressman justifies himself." The time has been when a Republican Congressman, especially from Massachusetts, would know if he was publicly putting the brand of infamy upon himself. Mr. Walker seems to be cheerfully unconscious of his own disgrace, of which he is himself the historian. His frank narrative of the degradation and danger involved in all such cowardly compromises as the Sherman Law may, however, help, as an awful warning, to save us from any more such debauchery of the conscience by Congressmen who now confess that they were willing to bring the country to the verge of financial ruin for "political considerations."

It is no wonder that Senator Sherman has protested against giving his name to the Silver Law of 1890, which is now the most roundly and universally cursed measure of recent history. Yet there is a poetic fitness in having that law go into the books bearing the name of the man whose fatal turn for trimming in politics was finally carried over into finance. If this last effort of his constructive genius as a financier serves to eclipse the reputation gained by his earlier achievements, he has only himself to thank for it. If there is any sphere of politics in which "tricking short-cuts and little fallacious facilities" are absolutely deadly, both to the general well-being and to the repute of the man guilty of them, it is the sphere of financial legislation. How dangerously versatile Mr. Sherman has been in such matters is forcibly shown by a writer in the last *Journal of Political Economy*, who collates the three different and conflicting reasons given by the Ohio Senator in public debate for the dropping of the silver dollar in the Coinage Act of 1873. On March 30, 1876, he said it was dropped "simply because it is inconvenient in size and form for ordinary coinage and ordinary business." Less than a month later, on April 25, he gave as the reason that the silver dollar, in 1873, "was worth more than a dollar in gold," and "there was no use then in issuing it." Still later, in 1892, he said that it had been omitted because "it had practically been obsolete for a long period of years."

With the spread of the money stringency, the New York banks have been confronted with fresh problems of policy, and their method of meeting such problems has furnished further and very important precedents for the financial future. Last week the money troubles, which had hitherto centred in the mercantile trade, descended suddenly on Wall Street. The currency movement to the West had indeed virtually ceased the week before, but the relief thus gained was offset by the "tying-up" of local funds. The 1st of July is one of the great "disbursement days" in corporation finance. It has been estimated that the interest and dividend payments due in this country in July aggregate not less than $100,000,000. Of this the greater part is payable in New York, and the holding of such money subject to draft temporarily withdraws much of that amount from the money market. The Federal Treasury wisely anticipated by nearly two weeks the payment of Government bond interest, and numerous wealthy corporations have followed its example. But in the strained condition of the market, and with scores of private lenders holding back for exorbitant rates, the relief was felt but slowly. On Thursday the strain became so violent as to threaten imminent disaster. Stock-market prices fell, and money rose to the exceptional rate of 73 per cent. Hitherto the city banks have properly held aloof from free accommodation to the security market;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for, of all things, speculation for a rise, in such a situation, is most to be avoided. But the possibility of demoralizing failures was too dangerous an alternative, and five of the strongest banks accordingly, having increased their resources through the use of Clearing-house certificates, appeared on Thursday as free lenders of money on the Stock Exchange. The effect was instantaneous. Money rates broke at once, and the stock market returned to equilibrium. The action, though almost unprecedented, was wise and timely, and probably averted serious trouble.

It has been observed that the $3,000,000 thus loaned for the banks was put out almost at the day's highest rate, and this has evoked some criticism. A moment's consideration will, however, show the wisdom of that policy. Had the bankers offered this sum at 6 per cent., there was a chance that most of it would be snapped up by brokers anxious to enter on new ventures. But no such broker would pay 50 or 60 per cent. for his accommodation. The people who borrowed this money at the abnormal rate demanded were necessarily people whose present needs were very pressing, and the rate was a fair measure of their emergency. Nor was the moral effect of the bank experiment lost by the high rate, for money promptly fell again to 6 per cent., and the critical strain of the day was over.

The immunity of London during the present generation from so critical a money stringency as has existed in New York in the past week is explained by the soundness of the English currency system. The trouble throughout this country has been aggravated by two causes: first, the actual hoarding of money by local capitalists fearful of a lapse to a silver basis; and, second, our inability to get relief from abroad, owing to a similar distrust on the part of foreign capitalists. A month ago, when the Australian banks went down, London was threatened with precisely such a crisis. It found relief in drawing instantly, and to enormous amounts, on Paris. London's credit being high, the accommodation was readily granted. Our situation has been such that, with sterling exchange far below the gold-importing point, we could not get the requisite gold in England. In other words, this week's experience is only a continuance, in a highly intensified form, of the symptoms reflected ever since the passage of our Law of 1890, through the withdrawal of foreign capital from this country.

We think the Colorado mine-owners will have a fine time of it cutting off the world's supply of silver. They may shut down if they choose, but Mexico will hardly go out of the business at the very moment when dangerous competitors shut up shop. Indeed, Mexican despatches show that the Mexican mines and mints are prepared to keep right on at the old stand, having all the facilities requisite for supplying any number of new customers. There is no sentiment about the Mexicans in this matter, as they have to pay for more than half of their foreign purchases by silver exports, and the bigger the foreign demand the better they will be suited and the more new mines they will open. Further than this, the outraged Colorado men who propose to bring the world to its senses by letting it see if it can get on without their silver, ought to reflect that their action, if really serious and persisted in, would furnish just the chance the country is aching for to get rid of the accumulation in the Treasury. There are stored up about 150,000,000 ounces, or three years' product, and it would be the easiest thing in the world to let that dribble out upon the market while the angry miners were taking a rest.

The Treasury has turned the corner of the fiscal year with a nominal surplus of about $2,000,000. We call this surplus a *nominal one for two reasons. If the Treasury* operations on the score of the National Bank Deposit and Redemption Fund were reckoned in, as they should be in strictness, the surplus would be turned into a deficit of $4,000,000, as the outlay on that account was $6,000,000 more than the income. Secretary Carlisle, however, has adhered to Mr. Foster's form of statement, leaving this account out altogether, and so making an apparent surplus. The other reason why the surplus is rather nominal than real is, that the appropriations have not been paid as provided by law. This is another imitation of the practice of the late Administration, made necessary by lack of funds, the only difference being that Mr. Carlisle has made no secret of his embarrassments and has not prevaricated about his enforced retrenchments, as Secretary Foster did. The customs revenue turned out to be $6,000,000 larger than the estimates, but the internal revenue $5,000,000 smaller. The fiscal year closed with the gold reserve at $95,485,413, and the net cash balance at $26,976,877. These figures show that the country will be forced to the virtue of economy for some time to come.

In the published records of failures for the first half of this disastrous year, the most remarkable feature is the large percentage of assets to liabilities. The number of individual failures during the six months of 1893 exceeds the record of any corresponding period since the resumption of specie payments. The amount of liabilities also breaks the record, surpassing by $56,000,000 the total of 1884, in which the business panic was similarly concentrated in the early spring and summer months. But the percentage of assets to liabilities, which reached 56 in 1884, and only 48 in 1890, rose to 61 this year—a proportion, we believe, quite without precedent. From the most obvious point of view, this is a highly reassuring fact. It proves beyond question that there has been no general rottenness in business enterprises, and that the trouble was not aggravated by universally inflated values. Indeed, one of the most impressive facts in this year's business collapse has been the generally reasonable level of prices at which the break began. In a few cases, such as the industrial stocks on our own market and some of Chicago's local securities, there had been reckless expansion; but in the great majority of commodities and investments no such process had taken place. In stocks, indeed, the June collapse followed a long season of liquidation; in wheat, the manipulators for the rise had in effect been already beaten before the money stringency. As these facts testify to the unparalleled severity of the money "squeeze," so they furnish promise of a recovery more speedy than is apt to follow panic. Not less significant is the fact that out of the 284 failures running up to $100,000 or more, 79 were those of banks and bankers alone, and 49 confined to three trades already paralyzed by dulness and overproduction—lumber, leather and shoes, and iron and steel. In the dry-goods business proper only six failures of any note have been recorded, with total liabilities barely exceeding a million and a half.

Trade journals are noting the fact that the price of wool is the lowest in its history. In fact, one of them says: "Medium wools have reached free-trade prices, and fine wools are getting there." The causes of this condition of the wool market are given by the paper in question as lack of mercantile confidence, monetary stringency, apprehension of tariff legislation, and the backward spring. But no tariff legislation can do any worse than make wool free, and if it is already at "free-trade prices," despite McKinley, what is there to be afraid of? It looks as if the farmers could not be terrified by a prospect worse than the worst. It is conceivable, though, that a lot more dire might yet be theirs. If McKinley were to have his way and get higher duties on wool, it might sink even below free-trade prices.

Surveyor Lyon has followed Appraiser Cooper's example and refused to give the Custom-house Commission any information about the workings of his office, basing his refusal upon technical objections to the Commission's legal standing. This is a most short-sighted policy, even from a partisan point of view. Only a little while ago the party organs were inviting the Commission to "come on," asserting that there was "nothing to conceal" and that "everything would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be thrown open." After all that, it will have a bad effect to see chief of division after chief of division run away at the first fire and act like an accused person who refuses to incriminate himself or speak at all except by advice of counsel. One of the requests made of Surveyor Lyon was directed to the "qualifications" of the men in his division. We suspect it was this inquiry which aroused his grave doubts about the legality of the Commission. From his standpoint, we admit, if there is no law against compelling him to exhibit the absurd incompetence of his subordinates, after the fashion of the Appraiser's office, there ought to be one in short order.

Gov. Flower's address at the alumni dinner of St. Lawrence University last week was a frank approval of education. He boldly admitted that he believed in it, provided it did not "encourage socialism and anarchy, undermine patriotism, and bring republican institutions into scorn." Moreover, he was in favor of the scholar in politics. He wanted the graduating class to "be good citizens," to "take an interest in public affairs," although not to be "impatient of attaining the millennium." Even while the Governor was speaking, a lot of college men in Albany were taking him at his word and showing their interest in public affairs. The particular affair to which they addressed themselves was the scandalous manner in which the Governor of this State had allowed the civil-service laws to be violated or evaded. They discovered that over 100 persons were holding office illegally, and that a great number of arbitrary transfers had been made from the competitive to the non-competitive schedules. Is it being impatient of the millennium to call for the enforcement of the law? And will the Governor tell us in his next address whether it is education or something else that brings republican institutions into scorn in the way pointed out by the Civil-Service Reform League?

One of the worst blunders committed by President Harrison was his abuse of the appointing power by the conferring of office upon editors. We greatly regret that Mr. Cleveland has imitated Mr. Harrison's pernicious example. He has already appointed a large number of editors to office, and the list grows longer every week. While there has been no single nomination so important as that of Whitelaw Reid for Minister to France or Murat Halstead to Russia, there have been many of the same grade as those of John C. New for Consul-General at London and Ellis H. Roberts for Assistant United States Treasurer. The editors of such leading Democratic organs in their respective States as the Indianapolis *Sentinel* in Indiana, the Montgomery *Advertiser* in Alabama, the Detroit *Free Press* in Michigan, and the St. Paul *Globe* in Minnesota have been thus rewarded with rich "plums," while a host of less conspicuous editors have been given minor places; four out of eight consulates in one recent list going into the offices of the Graham (Va.) *Headlight*, the Columbus (O.) *Westvolk*, the Plainfield (N. Y.) *Press*, and the Louisville (Ky.) *Truth*. If there were any ground for believing that the editors thus picked out were "the fittest men," it would not be so bad, but no evidence to this effect is offered, while some of Cleveland's appointments have been quite as ridiculous as any of Harrison's.

Complaints about the mail service during the past four months have been far fewer than during the corresponding period after the change of Administration in either 1889 or 1885. The reason is that the railway mail service is now under the Civil-Service Law, as it was not in 1885, nor in 1889 until after Mr. Harrison had suspended Cleveland's order to that effect long enough to allow a host of changes for political reasons. Formerly the service was demoralized by the turning out of old and trained men to make room for new and ignorant ones, who must learn at the expense of the public convenience. Under the new régime no changes are made except for cause, and the work goes on as smoothly as in any well-regulated business establishment.

The several official accounts of the loss of the *Victoria* are now before the public, and seem to leave no doubt that the disaster was due to a blunder of Vice-Admiral Tryon's. Capt. Bourke's testimony is almost decisive on this point, as he represents the Admiral as having agreed that the distance between the two divisions should be eight cables instead of six, and yet as having, for some unexplained reason, given the order for six, and left it so even after being remonstrated with by the staff commander. One can understand something of the feelings which drove a brave officer to the determination to go to the bottom with his ship and men rather than to try to escape from the effects of his own carelessness. The official account also explains what has hitherto seemed unaccountable, namely, Admiral Tryon's refusal to accept aid, and actually ordering the other ships not to send out boats. It seems that all the water-tight doors were closed before the collision, when it was seen to be inevitable, and it was reported to the Admiral that "all was tight."

The success of the Belgians in wresting universal suffrage from the fears of the ruling classes seems to have inspired the Austrian workingmen to labor for a similar result in a similar way. The suffrage in Austria is now given to all who pay a minimum of five florins in direct taxes. To make it universal is now the avowed object of the leaders of the workingman's party, who, three weeks after the May Day demonstrations in the Prater, issued a sort of appeal to the country, and particularly to the laboring classes, on the subject. The design is to foment an agitation which will have assumed huge proportions by the time Parliament meets in the fall, when, it is hoped, the course of events in Brussels may be repeated in Vienna. Every few weeks inflammatory pamphlets and proclamations are to be distributed broadcast, and the workingmen's newspapers are to have "Universal Suffrage" printed on them in large type. Great meetings are also to be held — in fact, are already being held, as on June 13 at Reichenberg, when 15,000 workingmen passed resolutions in favor of the right of suffrage for every man and woman over twenty years of age. Gatherings of Socialists have also been held at Budapest, at Prague, and elsewhere, at which motions in favor of universal suffrage were enthusiastically voted. It would be rash to assume that the methods which were triumphant in Belgium will be equally so in Austria, yet there seems to be every promise of a vigorous attempt to put them to the proof.

The propriety of the use of real names in works of fiction was lately under discussion in Paris, on occasion of the report that Edmond de Goncourt was about to dramatize his novel published a dozen years ago and entitled 'La Faustin.' He received a letter from a certain M. Faustin warning him against giving that name to a play, and threatening him with legal proceedings in case he did. The author replied that he had not yet written the play, and did not know that he ever should write it, but that he should not be deterred by the threat of a law-suit from using the name of the heroine of his novel. He protested that if such claims as that of M. Faustin were to be allowed to be valid, writers would be compelled to go back to the practice of the morality plays, and name their characters Chastity, Diligence, Good-Sense, and the like. It was, in fact, the contention of one French writer some years ago that such a method should be observed so far as to omit the names of the hero and heroine of all novels, simply designating them the Lover and the Beloved. The law of the matter was laid down by the Tribunal of the Seine in February, 1882, in a suit brought against Zola, in which the Court decided that an author could be held liable for the use of a particular name in a work of fiction only when such use tended to "render odious or ridiculous" the person or persons who bore it. Under this decision it is difficult to see how M. Faustin could recover damages, even if he should yet have to endure seeing his name in great letters on the bill-boards.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GREAT "CONSPIRACY."

MUCH of the talk of the silverites during the last twenty years not only discredited the national intelligence, but the human mind itself. Their account of the divinely appointed place of silver in human society, their ascription to it of human virtues—such as fidelity, local attachment, and sympathy with poverty and misfortune—and, above all, their contention that 15 to 1 was the ratio between it and gold appointed by the Creator in the interest of permanent bimetallism, have been a sore trial for those who cared not simply for the intellectual reputation of the American people, but for the fair fame of democracy as a rational system of government. The conversion of silver into a fetish and an object of half-worship seemed an exploit better fitted for the denizens of the African forests than for the "heirs of all the ages" who know and utter and argue freely under the American flag.

But we doubt whether even these earlier aberrations were, on the whole, as queer as the latest one, which makes the fall of silver and its demonetization by the leading nations of the world the result of a "conspiracy" against silver and bimetallism. "Conspiracy" has been until now a term applied to small knots or combinations of men compelled by their weakness to rely on secrecy for the accomplishment of their designs. A public conspiracy, or a conspiracy of such numbers as to make secrecy impossible, or, in short, a conspiracy of the majority against the minority, has hitherto been considered a contradiction in terms. But the silver-men have introduced the practice of treating everybody who differs from them as a "conspirator," even if the term should thus be made to cover the whole human race except the few thousands in this country and Europe who are afflicted with the bimetallic or silver delusion. All the more highly civilized nations of the earth, including the democratic ones, such as England, France, Italy, Holland, Switzerland, and Belgium, and the more monarchical, such as Germany and Austria, have for nearly twenty years been slowly discarding silver as a standard of value, owing to the great increase in its production; the chief use of money being, in their estimation, the supply of a measure of value for commodities and contracts. This has been done with the utmost publicity, after much discussion, by men who have devoted their lives to the study of financial questions, and with absolute calm.

Furious monometallists are, we think, as little known in the leading European countries as passionate or hysterical bankers or dry-goods men are here. Questions of currency are discussed there as business simply, and signs of enthusiasm about a metal would injure the credit of a business man. Consequently there has been no more popular excitement over the question of the standard of value in England, France, or Germany than over the standard of time. The question is left to experts, with the general understanding that Government is not to supply people with money, but with a legal-tender as nearly stable as a measure of value as the nature of the materials within our reach for such purposes will permit. No European monometallist has appeared to announce that gold is a perfectly stable standard which never has risen or fallen, and never will rise or fall in relation to other commodities, or to pretend that he knows of anything of the kind "on God's footstool," as Jerry Simpson would say. The provision of a perfect measure of value, which will under no circumstances expand or contract, is, like the squaring of the circle and the discovery of perpetual motion, left to charlatans and visionaries. What rational business men do is to search for the nearest approach to such a standard which the constitution of the globe and the nature of the human mind will permit; but they carry on the search without emotion of any description, just as if they were working at a mathematical problem.

Under these circumstances, the theory that the scientists and business men of the Old World who are engaged in the search for the standard, and have discarded silver after full examination, and the two or three hundred millions of people who know what they are about and approve of their labors, are engaged in a "conspiracy" against Jones, and Bland, and Peffer, and Simpson, and Warner, and the like, and the numerous voters in the Southern and Western States who would like more money, helps more and more to bring us into disrepute as an honest business people. The irrationality of our talk, in fact, does us nearly as much damage as the confusion of our currency. When 200,000,000 are accused of conspiring to cheat 1,000 through hatred of a white metal, far from wishing to trade with them, they want to lock them up and send for a doctor. When a United States Senator says—

> "The suspension of silver coinage in India shows, in the first place, that the millionaires and money sharks of the Old World are in copartnership with the money-lenders and monopolists of Wall Street, and that there is a combined effort on the part of the wealthy and influential elements of the Old and New World to grind the poor classes down to the lowest notch."

no sane person likes to argue with him, or lend him money, or invite him to his house, or consult him about anything whatever. It is true that it is Peffer of Kansas who talks in this way, and we know Peffer, but foreign investors do not. They think he fairly represents the American Senate, and they resolve to get their capital away from under him and his kind.

The term "silver lunacy," has been treated as a term of vituperation, but it is nothing of the kind. It is strictly descriptive. It denotes a wave of popular hallucination, such as in past ages usually arose in the field of religion and dealt with the supernatural, or expended itself on the infidels or the witches or the Jews. Had we alone had to deal with it, there is no knowing into what slough it would have plunged us before passing away. Happily, some power over the object of the superstition remained in the hands of the sane portion of mankind in other countries. The Latin Union, England, and now India had the fortunes of the idol more or less in their hands, and have, mercifully for us, used their power to rip him open and exhibit his fraudulent insides to his dupes.

CIVIC DUTY.

MR. JAMES BRYCE, in an article on the "Teaching of Civic Duty" in the July *Forum*, points out with characteristic clearness and accuracy some of the chief reasons why popular government in this country and elsewhere is so often misgovernment. He divides patriotism into two kinds, one which concerns itself with services and sacrifices to protect one's fatherland against external enemies, and the other with devotion to all that can subserve its inner welfare. The latter, or "home side of patriotism, this sober and quiet sense of what a man owes to the community into which he is born, and which he helps to govern," has been found, Mr. Bryce truly says, specially hard to maintain in modern times and in large countries. In regard to our large cities, and especially the city of New York, nothing is more notable than the almost total lack of this home patriotism. Our citizens are capable of working themselves into a fury of Jingo patriotism over some trifling international incident, like that of a row among drunken sailors in the streets of Valparaiso, or like the unthinking hullaballoo over a proposal to annex Hawaii, but they bear with complete indifference the constant scandal of an ignorant and corrupt municipal administration which brings disgrace upon the name of popular government the world over.

So, too, in regard to State and national affairs. The low estate to which our legislative bodies have sunk is spoken of almost universally with contempt and ridicule, but seldom with any sign of consciousness that their condition is a reflection upon our capacity for self-government, which injures the good name of the nation more seriously than any international question that has arisen for many years, or is likely to arise for many more, is capable of doing. All this is due to the absence of the "home side of patriotism," among our people, the lack of that habit of civic duty which Mr. Bryce defines as the willingness "to take trouble, personal and even tedious trouble, for the well governing of every public community one belongs to, be it a township or parish, a ward or a city, or the nation as a whole." The chief reason for this lack is that nearly everybody is so much absorbed in the pursuit of wealth that he is not willing to give any

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time or thought to public affairs. It makes little impression upon the merchants and professional men of this city to call their attention to the ignorance, extravagance, and corruption of the government under which they are living; they admit the facts, but decline to make any personal effort towards removing or even lessening the evils. "We have no time for politics," they say. "Things are disgracefully bad, undoubtedly, but they have always been so, and you can't make them any better by calling attention to them." As for a sense of patriotic obligation as American citizens to make the city government intelligent, economical, and thus beneficial to the whole people, the citizens who feel that deeply enough to have their conduct influenced by it are hard to find.

One excuse heard very often is that, with our large ignorant foreign population, nothing better is possible. The answer to that is that there is not a large city in the United States in which the native-born element, representing its intelligence and property, is not in a majority if it be united. The trouble is that this element, by dividing into two nearly equal portions under party names which have no meaning in local affairs, completely nullify their own power. This is brought about again by the lack of that habit of civic duty which Mr. Bryce defines as striving to know what is best for one's country or community as a whole, placing that above party feeling, or class feeling, or any other sectional passion or motive. The real foe of good government is not ignorance, but the indolence and partisan blindness of the intelligence of the community. Every man who has given the subject close observation is forced to that conclusion very early in his investigations. Mr. Bryce's words on this point are well worth quoting:

"It is common to talk of ignorance as the chief peril of democracies. That it is a peril no one denies, and we are all, I hope, agreed that it has become more than ever the duty of the State to insist not only on a more penetrating and stimulative instruction, but upon the inclusion of the elements of constitutional knowledge among the subjects to be taught in the higher standards of our schools. Democracy has, however, another foe not less pernicious. This is indolence. Indifference to public affairs shows itself not merely in a neglect to study them, and fit one's self to give a judicious vote, but in the apathy which does not care to give a vote when the time arrives. It is a serious evil already in some countries—serious in London, very serious in Italy; serious enough in the United States (not, indeed, at Presidential, but at city and other local elections) for some reformer to have proposed to punish with a fine the citizen who neglects to vote, as in some old Greek city the law proclaimed penalties against the citizen who in a sedition stood aloof, taking neither one side nor the other. For, unhappily, it is the respectable, well-meaning, easy-going citizen, as well as the merely ignorant citizen, who is apt to be listless. Those who have their private ends to serve, their axes to grind and logs to roll, are not indolent. Private interest spurs them on, and if the so-called 'good citizen,' who has no desire or aim except that good government which benefits him no more than every one else, does not bestir himself, the public funds may become the plunder, and the public interests the sport, of unscrupulous adventurers."

In this and many other American cities, this stage was reached years ago. The result is that in most of them popular government exists only in name, and that a class of politicians have been bred who have made the business of plundering cities a profession in which not only are great fortunes accumulated swiftly, but their accumulation, even when visible to the public which is robbed to supply them, excites no especial attention. It is surely time that a comprehensive plan for the propagation of correct ideas in home patriotism or civic duty was started in every city in the land.

THE GERMAN PARLIAMENT.

CHANCELLOR CAPRIVI, since he took office in 1890, has been confronted with the same parliamentary problems which Bismarck had to face between 1881 and 1887. The Government has had to be carried on without a governmental majority, and Caprivi, like Bismarck, has attempted to do this by a series of bargains with one or another group of the heterogeneous Opposition.

In 1887 Bismarck obtained a good majority, but in 1890 he lost it again, and at once opened new negotiations with the Ultramontanes. While these were in progress the young Emperor discharged him and put Caprivi in his place. It was in every respect a change of persons without change of policy: in internal as in external affairs Caprivi followed almost slavishly in Bismarck's footsteps, but with less clearness of aim and much less consistency. He took up the negotiations with the Ultramontanes, and succeeded for a time in purchasing their support. Bismarck had so wisely husbanded his concessions to that party that something was still left to compromise on—just enough to carry Caprivi through two of the following three years. Then it became necessary to offer the Clericals something positive, and the Government introduced in the Prussian Diet a primary-education bill, which practically substituted confessional for secular schools. This bill might perhaps have been carried, against the opposition of all shades of Liberals, by Conservative, Clerical, and Polish votes, but the outcry throughout the kingdom so alarmed the Emperor and his Chancellor that the bill was withdrawn. The Ultramontanes turned promptly against the Government, and in the decisive votes on the late Army Bill the party was almost solidly arrayed in opposition.

Caprivi had indeed other strings to his bow, but they were weak ones. Slight concessions were made to the Poles in administrative and church matters, and were gratefully received; but the Poles had only sixteen votes. More important was the attempted conciliation of the free-trade Liberals. In 1891 and 1892 commercial treaties were negotiated with a number of Germany's neighbors, which reduced the tariff on grain, and thus largely nullified the protection given to the agrarian interest. The German Liberal party welcomed this change of policy; but its radical wing, under the leadership of Eugene Richter, refused, in accordance with its unbroken tradition, to render any aid to the Government in return. Only a few of the more recent recruits—those who had seceded from the National Liberal party on the tariff issue—emancipated themselves from Richter's domination and voted for the Army Bill. The net gain which Caprivi derived from his commercial treaties was therefore slight. On the other hand, those treaties offended a large section of the Conservatives, and made them lukewarm in their allegiance to the Government.

After the defeat of the Army Bill, Caprivi, still following in Bismarck's track, attempted to secure a more docile Reichstag by a dissolution and an appeal to the patriotism of the Empire. But, as the old adage has it, when two persons do the same thing it is not the same thing. Bismarck was backed in 1887 by the old Emperor and Moltke and his own triumphant past. Germany's allies were held well in hand, and the wires of European diplomacy were skilfully pulled to play upon the fears of the German electors. Caprivi's position in the electoral campaign which has just closed was in every respect weaker. William II.'s name is not one to conjure with; military opinion is understood to be divided on the expediency of many of the proposed changes in the army; the utterances of Germany's allies have been maliciously optimistic as regards the chance of a prolonged European peace; and Caprivi's own brief career has convinced every one of his honesty and good intentions, but no one of his ability. Under the circumstances it is rather surprising that the elections have resulted so favorably for him. Aided by a split in the Clerical party, and in the secondary ballots by the consternation felt at the Social Democratic gains, the Government appears to have secured a slight majority, not necessarily for the proposed law, but for some increase of the army. But this majority is a very composite one, with little suggestion of stability. The Conservatives and National Liberals have made gains, but have not obtained a majority of the seats; and the next Army Bill will be carried by the aid of free-trade Liberals, dissentient Clericals, Anti-Semites, and Poles. This is not a majority on which the Government can count for other purposes, and it is not easy to see how a stable majority is to be constructed.

It is not impossible that the free-traders who left the National Liberal party in 1879, and who have now abandoned the German Liberals, may again swing back into the National Liberal party. But even then the Conservatives and Moderate Liberals would not be in the majority; nor could they, under existing conditions, act in harmony. The tariff question, which Caprivi's commercial treaties have brought to the front again, makes this impossible; for even if Caprivi were willing to go fur-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ther in breaking down the protective system, he could not carry the Conservatives with him. As long as Bismarck was at the helm, the Conservatives were an absolutely reliable governmental party. They followed him through years of liberal and anti-clerical legislation; they gave their votes for the destruction of feudal jurisdictions and for the free migration of the laboring classes, for the complete emancipation of the Jews, and for civil marriage. They followed him with the same dismay with which the English Tories often followed Disraeli, but they followed *quand même* because he was their leader as well as the chosen representative of the Crown. But the Conservatives feel no such allegiance to Caprivi. They do not see now why they should not compel the Government to follow them. They have been educated, during the past few years, to the *do ut des* view of politics. They are not likely to support the Government unless it becomes again frankly and thoroughly protectionist—and that will alienate a section of the Moderate Liberals.

It seems certain, therefore, that Caprivi, or any other Chancellor whom the Emperor may put in his place, will be forced to make terms with the Ultramontanes, and that during the next few years German parliamentary politics will be dominated by a Conservative-Clerical alliance. This outlook is a discouraging one. It means the continued supremacy of protectionism, and it may well mean reactionary legislation in many directions. The anti-Semitic wing of the Conservative party will demand laws against usury and stock-exchange gambling, which the Clericals will gladly support, and, as against the secular schools, orthodox Lutherans and Roman Catholics will readily join hands again.

Against such a coalition the Liberals, Radicals, and Social Democrats will be found united in opposition, but in this opposition there will be negative harmony only. It is not the sort of opposition which, even in a strictly parliamentary monarchy, could conceivably become a governmental party. As the lines are now drawn in the Reichstag, the increase of the Social Democratic vote is unimportant. It means simply the shifting of votes from one opposition party to another. Richter and his friends, who have lost more than the Social Democrats have gained, have always been as *intransigeant* as Liebknecht and his associates. The chief difference between the two parties is this: that the Social Democrats have a positive programme, while the Richter Radicals have never been anything but a party of pure negation.

JOHN DICKINSON AND THE PENNSYLVANIA CONSTITUTION OF 1776.

BROOKLYN, July 1, 1893.

IT has been the fashion of our historical writers, first introduced by Bancroft, to treat the conduct of John Dickinson in relation to the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1776 as that of an "irreconcilable." If their judgment be accepted, he continued to worship the old royal charter long after it had been replaced by a republican and democratic Constitution; refused the oath of allegiance, resigned his commission, and withdrew from the State, rather than give free institutions even tacit support. In proof of this view, little evidence has been given; to that which has been available I can now add what I trust will cause a stay of judgment, if not a reversal of it.

The Constitution of 1776 was prepared under conditions and circumstances which made opposition to it almost certain. In 1776, the controlling party of the Assembly was a coalition formed of the Quaker-German-commercial interests, led by John Dickinson. In the face of this conservative majority, the Opposition or "popular" minority were unable successfully to fight, and they therefore withdrew or seceded, leaving the Assembly without a quorum, and thus not able to act. Then, trumpeting forth that the legal authority would not take the steps necessary for the support of the Continental Congress and the war, they gathered with others in what they called a "provincial conference," and not merely passed several laws, but issued a call for a convention to frame a Constitution. Without a quorum to vote measures, without an executive (for the King's Governor had withdrawn), and with the "Associators" or militia (who were naturally almost wholly enlisted from the "popular" party) refusing to obey their orders, the Assembly was powerless to prevent this Convention from assembling. And though the majority of the people (if we take the recent vote of the whole province for Assemblymen as evidencing the public opinion) refused to vote for delegates, the Convention met, framed a Constitution, and, without giving either Assembly or people a chance to consider the plan, declared it established, required an oath of allegiance to it, and ordered a new Assembly elected under it.

On this the conservatives split into two camps. A large section refused either to stand for or to vote at this election, while the remainder, under Dickinson, though refusing to acknowledge the legality of this Government, held that the collapse of the legal Assembly left them no alternative but resigning all share in the Government, or endeavoring to gain possession of the new Assembly. They accordingly offered themselves as candidates, and, in spite of this split, secured seats enough to make them a formidable minority, and emboldened Dickinson to formulate a demand for a new Convention. Refused this, the minority played the same tactics before employed by the popular party, of withdrawing from the Assembly; and only the stress of war and the pressure of the Continental Congress induced enough of the conservatives to attend to give it a quorum and enable it to act. Dickinson himself resigned and withdrew from the State, though more from other motives than on account of his disapproval of these proceedings.

This outline of events hardly proves him an "irreconcilable," and some recently discovered evidence goes to show that Dickinson was quite ready, not merely to aid in forming a new Constitution, but even to accept that of the Convention, if it was amended so as to be equally fair to all parties in the State. For many years there has been in the possession of the Library Company of Philadelphia a rare broadside, entitled 'An Essay of a Declaration of Rights,' of which ninety-six copies were secretly printed for the use of members of the Convention of 1776. In examining this recently, I found that it had MS. notes and corrections which special familiarity with Dickinson's handwriting enabled me at once to fix upon him as the annotater. How he obtained this secret draft of the Convention, it is difficult to say; but it gives us some important light on his objections, not to the illegality of the drafting body, but to the draft itself, and serves as an index finger to mark certain points of friction between the two parties. Thus, in the second clause, the following change is made:

ESSAY.	DICKINSON'S MS.
Nor can any Man be justly deprived or abridged of any Civil Right as a Citizen on account of his peculiar Mode of Religious Worship.	Nor can any Man *who acknowledges the Being of a God*, be justly deprived or abridged of any Civil Right as a Citizen on account of his *religious sentiments* or Mode of religious Worship.

More curious still, in the light of his recent experience with majorities and minorities, is his change in the fifth clause:

ESSAY.	DICKINSON'S MS.
That Government is or ought to be instituted for the common Benefit, Protection and Security of the People, Nation or Community, and that a *Majority of the Community* hath an indubitable, unalienable, and indefeasible Right to reform, alter or abolish it in such a Manner as shall be by that Majority judged most conducive to the Public Weal.	That Government is or ought to be instituted for the common Benefit, Protection and Security of the People, Nation or Community, and that the *Community hath an* indubitable, unalienable and indefeasible Right to reform, alter or abolish, Government in such a Manner as shall be by that *Community* judged most conducive to the Public Weal.

There are several other amendments not so obvious in their import, besides many merely verbal changes. One more is of interest, however, as apparently intended to make the clause slightly more favorable to the Penn proprietors:

ESSAY.	DICKINSON'S MS.
That all Men have a natural inherent Right of Emigration from one State to any other that will receive them, or for the Forming a new State in vacant or purchased Countries, whenever they find that thereby they may promote their own Happiness.	That all Men have a natural inherent Right to Emigrate from one State to any other that will receive them, or to Form a new State in vacant Countries or such Countries as they can purchase whenever they find that thereby they may promote their own Happiness.

What makes the changes of real importance, however, is the fact that all these amendments were accepted by the Convention, and embodied in the Declaration of Rights as finally adopted, indicating that, directly or indirectly, Dickinson had a shaping hand in the work of the Convention.*

From this preliminary paper, it is interesting to turn to a copy of the Constitution as adopted, which is crowded with Dickinson's notes, to see how far the acceptance of his amendments had removed his dislike of the compact. After Clause III. he inserts:

"That all persons professing the Christian Religion [illegible] honestly scrupulous of taking an oath, ought not to be obliged by any Law to take an oath in order to be admitted into any offices, or to be examined as a witness in any cause or in any Court."

All who have studied the partisan and shameful abuse of test-laws in Pennsylvania will ap-

*Lest it should be concluded that Dickinson merely noted on this copy the changes made by the Convention in the draft, it should be stated that a number of the alterations on his copy were not made in the final instrument.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preciate the effect this clause would have had in defeating the "popular" party had it been adopted. That Dickinson was hardly prepared, however, to do without oaths is indicated by a further clause:

"That no other Oath, Affirmation, Test, or Qualification ought to be required on or in order to admission into any Office of Trust or profit, than an Oath of Allegiance to this State, an oath of Office, and a Declaration of a Belief in the Christian Religion exclusive of the articles disputed between the several sects thereof."

An even more important clause was one which he substitutes for the fourth:

CONSTITUTION AS ADOPTED.	DICKINSON'S CHANGE.
That all power being originally inherent in and consequently derived from the people, therefore all officers of Government, whether legislative or executive, are their trustees and servants, and at all times accountable.	That all power being originally inherent in the people, therefore all officers of Government, whether legislative, executive or judicial are their trustees and servants, and at all times accountable to them; and whenever the ends of Government are perverted and manifestly endangered by any magistrate or a treacherous combination of several, or whenever a Government shall be found inadequate to the purposes for which it was framed, the People have a Right and ought to establish a new form or reform the old Government in such manner as shall by the Community be judged most conducive to the public Weal.

That this hardly indicates a fixed determination to cling to the old charter is obvious.

Still further proofs exist, besides these two documents, to prove that Dickinson was willing to see a new Constitution for Pennsylvania framed. On July 18, or but three days after the Convention met, and long before it had begun constitution-making, a pamphlet entitled 'An Essay of a Frame of Government for Pennsylvania' was published in Philadelphia. It does not purport to be a complete instrument, but it outlines a new Constitution, and was clearly intended as a working basis for the Convention. Yet this pamphlet was written by John Dickinson, who "deserted his State in the hour of its most deadly peril rather than surrender an antiquated and undemocratic charter."

One more piece of evidence on his position exists in an almost unknown broadside, being "instructions" for the Representatives of Philadelphia, drafted by Dickinson, and adopted by a mass-meeting held just before the new Assembly met. As it was almost his last act in Pennsylvania politics, until recalled to assume the Governorship, five years later, it probably represents his final opinion:

"We require of you, therefore, to propose to the Assembly, as soon as it is convened, to make such alterations and amendment in the constitution formed by the late Convention as are necessary to render it a safe, rational and consistent frame of government, and we require your particular attention to the following instructions relative to that important business.

"You are to be careful to adopt such parts of the constitution formed by the late Convention as secure to the people annual elections, suitable division and rotation of offices, liberty of conscience, freedom of the press, and trial by juries.

"You are to use your endeavours to divide the supreme legislative power in such a manner as shall produce wise, just, and well digested counsels, and thus secure the State from the fatal influence of hasty, incorrect, passionate and prejudiced determinations."

PAUL LEICESTER FORD.

CARDUCCI AND HIS CRITICS.

BOLOGNA, June 16, 1893.

DURING the last fifteen years, no Italian writer has occupied the attention of the public, the pen of friendly and of hostile critics, as has and still does Giosuè Carducci; and even as I write he is engaged in a pitched battle with the sentimental opponents of war, who, alas! cry, Peace, peace! where there is no peace. Four separate poems were the fruits of the poet's hardly earned vacation in the Alps last summer—"La Bicocca," "Piedmont," "Cadore," "La Guerra." As a motto for this last poem, he took a sentence from the works of Carlo Cattaneo in which the natural history of war (not its apology) is given, and later quoted a letter of Alberto Mario, whose political writings Carducci is now editing with a preface, in which he will sum up and probably criticise the doctrines of the Federal Republicans. These quotations irritated the nerves of the peace-at-any-price school, and Napoleon Colajani (who, by the way, would be the first to shoulder his musket and climb to the summit of Castrogiovanni if the French from Biserta should invade the island sacred to the Vespers) attacked the poet with all the fierceness of the modern champions of peace. Fair play so far; but when he calls Carducci the "Poeta Cesarea," this striking below the belt is unworthy of the Sicilian patriot who has done and is doing so much for the purification of Italy morally and politically. I should not refer to this stupid accusation were it not repeated in Mr. Frank Sewall's excellent essay, "Giosuè Carducci and the Hellenic Reaction in Italy," prefixed to his recent American translation of the Poems.

"Without a formal coronation, Carducci occupies the position of poet-laureate of Italy," says Mr. Sewall. Quite other is Carducci's position. He refused to commemorate Cialdini because that general ordered "the fratricidal shot"

"Onde Aspromonte è infame";

and, on being asked by the democrat Ettore Ferrari, Italy's great sculptor, to write an ode or dedication for the album presented to Queen Margaret for the silver wedding, answered: "Why? When have I ever written to order?" and remained working hard as ever at Bologna throughout the senseless official jubilations. It is this independence that irritates the "Puritans" of all creeds and classes. The fine and exhaustive study of the political poetry of Giosuè Carducci by Prof. Domenico Zanichelli,* brother of the publishers of his works, sets in their true light the poet's opinions and aims, Italian to the core. Italian glory is his pride, Italian shame his cross. Hence, from 1860 to 1870, all his poems are revolutionary, but in none does he instigate his countrymen to upset monarchy and inaugurate a republic. Like Crispi, his one surviving Benjamin, he deems that "monarchy unites, a republic would separate us"; and Italian unity is the cornerstone of his creed. Hence his worship of Mazzini, "greatest after Dante." For his commemoration of the apostle of Italian unity at his death he was suspended by Messer Bonghi for eight months from his chair and stipend. Garibaldi has an entire volume of poems, which will live for ever.

From Aspromonte to Mentana, thence to the breach in Porta Pia, King, court, ministers, generals, quondam "revolutionists calmed down" are anathematized impartially by Carducci. When the servile municipality of Florence abolishes the commemoration of the heroes who fell at Curtatone and decrees funeral rites for the anniversary of the death of Charles Albert, the poet flagellates Tuscany entire. The sonnets during the Dante centenary seem inspired by the Ghibelline himself, especially the second, ending:

"Su, ribelli e spergiuri, a Roma, a Roma!".

During Mentana we have "Meminisse horret," the miserere in which Dante and Macchiavelli in Santa Croce tell harder truths to Italy than even they spoke in life. In "Heu pudor," after the tobacco jobbery, when loftiest personages and the vulgar herd were implicated, Vanni Fucci is held up as a model to the "puny, bastard pilferers of modern Italy." Still more scathing the satire when official Italy sat silent under Napoleon's insults to the King, and Rouher's *jamais* was left unchallenged. When Giovanni, the fourth of the Cairoli, dies of his wounds received at Villa Glori (Mentana), the poet vows to break his lyre on the gravestone of the dead. But all these poems, if revolutionary, are not republican: their alpha and omega is, "To Rome! to Rome!" When that goal was attained, when monarchy was compelled to choose between the "sacrilegious act" and abdication, when reluctantly the "devoted son of the Holy Father" ordered the breach in Porta Pia, when Rome was proclaimed capital of United Italy, the fiery invectives ceased, but no hymn of triumph heralded the entry into the Quirinal.

"*L'art pour l'art*" is not for our poet, neither revolution for revolution. There is a long pause; then we have the "Ripresa" in 1873, and at last in 1877 the "Odi Barbare," wherein no politics intrude. True, in 1879, after the attempt of Passanante on the King's life, which called forth indignant protests from Alberto Mario and the entire Republican party (the assassin's insanity being proved only later), we have the famous ode to the Queen, very tedious, very erudite, but quite other than "fulsome." Merely as a Queen, I doubt if a poem would have been dedicated to her; but Margaret is the daughter of the Duke of Genoa, the warrior prince who died in his prime. As such, she has two odes dedicated to her—just two too many is the utmost one can say. But neither is dictated by a courtier's pen, for flattery is an element unknown to Giosuè Carducci, as witness his discourse five years ago here in Bologna commemorating the eighth anniversary of the Bolognese University in presence of the King and Queen whose grandfather, father, and uncle had condemned to perpetual exile and to "ignominious death that great son of our fathers, Giuseppe Mazzini."

In his exposition of Carducci's crusade against "the lie enthroned in the Vatican," Mr. Sewall has excelled all Carducci's critics because he has seized the underlying thought and conviction that permeates the utterances of the poet; namely, that Christianity (or, as he puts it deftly, the *habit of Christianity*) imposed on the Italians has ever been antagonistic to the ancient national instinct, both religious and civil, and that the time has come to speak frankly, to act courageously—to say: "This surface life is false; these gorgeous processions and spectacles, these joyous festivals and picturesque rites, this sacrificial and vicarious theory of worship," are not religion, are not morality. Away with these mummeries and baubles; down with these airless, sunless tem-

* 'Studi Politici e Storici di Domenico Zanichelli: Le Poesie Politiche di Giosuè Carducci.' Bologna, 1893.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ples, these charnel-houses. Disperse this army of priests and friars, monks and nuns, sounding to heaven the cruel oppressor's praise, while God, and King, and Fatherland denying. Protestants, and American Puritans especially, will be less shocked at this treatment of Christianity so called "as a mere passing episode in the life of a nation," when they retrace the phases of Catholicism in Italy, where the Bible is still an unknown book, still forbidden (by the way, after Dante, it is the best-thumbed volume in Carducci's library).

The problems that troubled Dante are not those of his worshipper; neither, it seems to us, does any question of other worlds or immortality of the mortal individual torment him. Every now and then there comes a poetical allusion to a question or wonderment anent the "After."

"Superstito ai fati è Amor"

—Love outlives the fates—he exclaims, bidding the gods, "when justice and liberty shall possess the earth, to bring the glad tidings to his grave," when, in virtue of that love surviving death, he shall "hear their voices, and the ashes of the *vate* who on earth believed in and foretold the triumph of right and goodness will exult." Again, in "Innanzi," which should be read with the poem in which Carducci tells of his one only dead boy "Dante"; of his brother taken young; of his mother, idolized in life, never absent from his heart in death—of them "that thought, shipwrecked, again draws breath, and cries to heaven: O night, O winter, say, what are the dead doing down there in their graves?" It is the love lost, not the fear, that troubles him, and soon he says, in snow-deep winter: "Birds that homeless wander, peck at the darkened window, souls of the lost ones returning, they watch me and call me to them. Shortly, O dear ones, shortly! (Heart, tame thy restless rebelling!) Down to your silence, down to your peaceful shades, will I come."

Catholicism is dead, though its skeleton is kept above ground, as in the hideous stinking cemetery of the Capuchins in Palermo. "The rebellion that moved from the cloister," led by Savonarola, Luther, Calvin, "shattered the fetters that bound human thought," but the new religious faith has not yet dawned. This it is that creates "the aching void," tempers the enjoyment of sunshine, beauty, sensuous delights. The sun may "never set for the gods of Greece"; they may "still sleep in ancient woods, in flowers and mountain streams and the eternal seas," but they do not answer the lofty hope that cries, "O when shall labor be happy, and faithful love secure from harm? When shall a mighty nation of freemen say in the face of the sun, 'Shine no more on the idle ease and the selfish wars of tyrants, but on the pious justice of labor?'" The poems entitled "Carnival," most exquisitely rendered by Mr. Sewall, show how deeply this problem affects the poet. But in Carducci's prose and poetry not a shadow of sentimentalism, not a morbid line is found. His remedy lies in work and in research after truth. This is the age of destruction, of clearing away all the rubbish, dust, and débris of long centuries of superstition, ignorance, violence, and fraud.

"Or distruggiam. Dei Secoli
Lo strato è sul pensiero:
O pochi e forti, all' opera,
Che nei profundi è il vero."

In his translation Mr. Sewall is not as happy as usual:

"Now we destroy. Of the ages
The highway is built upon thinking:
O few and strong, to the work!
For truth's at the bottom."

The fundamental idea is: Let us destroy. The stratum (refuse) of ages weighs upon or has overcrusted thought: few but strong, to the task (of removing the ruins)! For truth lies beneath in the deepest depths (*profundi*).

I make no attempt to versify. Translation is an art that Americans possess in a most enviable degree; and if Mr. Sewall follow up his little book with other translations of poetry and prose, he will do good service to America, and to Italy also, in making known her "greatest" (*sommo*). If only another "few" worked as does Carducci, the excavations would go on speedily. Never does he miss a lesson at the University save when at Rome on educational business or to record his vote in the Senate. While his past works, which will fill twenty volumes, are going through the press, he is preparing new ones—just now a collection of 'Rime Antiche Italiane'—songs of all provinces before Dante's time, beginning with Pier delle Vigne and the Emperor Frederick. Hard as he works, he certainly is not "ashamed of human delights and human comforts, and refuses none of the paths that lead to these." First of all he has a delightful home, for wife "a perfect woman nobly planned"; then he adores his grandchildren. Bice (see Mr. Sewall's translation of "My Daughter's Marriage," xxxi.) was

"born when over my poor roof did pass
Hope like a homeless, wandering nightingale."

Elvira (the grandmother's name) and Giosuè, the eldest, are both studious, and when time passes without a sight of them Carducci will dash off to Leghorn and "bring them home"; but the studies go on, and Elvira has to give daily account of her progress in Latin, which does not prevent her being one of the healthiest and jolliest of young mortals. Then in the holiday, when lectures, Senate, printers' devils are left behind, the poet rushes to the Alps, and there revels in nature, setting himself no special task, working or not as the spirit moves him—and it never fails to move him. Will Mr. Sewall not translate last autumn's inspiration on "Cadore"? Not to Titian does Cadore owe her greatest glory, but to her braves who defied the German Army during the league of Cambray, thus saving Venice; and again to Pietro Calvi, who, in 1848, led the forlorn hope, lived conspiring and leading expeditions against the Austrians, till, the companion of Orsini in the dungeons of Mantua, he was shot to death at Belfiore, a republican hero and martyr.

This year, if the muse does not suggest some aerial flight, a soberer theme is to be "thought out" during the autumn holiday. Carducci is set on writing the history of the Italian Renaissance between 1789 and 1870—Italy's political, artistic, literary reawakening—to show how Italian thought has evolved and formed itself. This will be a most valuable contribution to the story of modern Italy, for, saving Foscolo's lectures on literature and the scattered monographs on revolutionary attempts, we have no key to the inner life which transformed the seven provinces of struggling slaves into the one independent and united Nation.

J. W. M.

Correspondence.

CONSULAR INVOICES.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Permit me to offer a few considerations in confirmation of your recent article entitled "Our Consular System," touching that portion of our tariff regulations which requires that every importation of foreign goods beyond a nominal value must be accompanied by an invoice bearing the certificate of the consular officer nearest to the place where the goods were purchased. As you correctly observe, the consular certificate is useless, because to be of value it would need to be the consul's certification that the goods shipped were identical with those billed, and this he could determine only after an examination of the goods. Such an examination is impracticable for many reasons. Sometimes, indeed, the goods are bought in places where no consular agent is resident, and then the only feasible way is to send the invoices by post to the nearest consul, to be returned after the consular seal has been attached. But even if a consul should examine the goods at the time of sale and before they were packed, it would still be of little or no benefit, for he could not control the handling of them from that time until they were shipped, during which interval his certificate might be rendered invalid; and this seems to be understood at our custom-houses, for the American importer is himself required to take oath to the correctness of the invoices presented by him, and not unreasonably, because what is really desired is a bona-fide invoice for the goods actually delivered to the custom-house. But this would seem to render the previous consular certification a work of supererogation.

You did not exaggerate the trouble and vexation caused the foreign dealer by this regulation. The several copies required of the invoice must be made out upon special blanks furnished at the consulate, and they must therefore be sent for from time to time, and not too infrequently, because the forms are liable to be changed, and if an old one has been used, the three or four copies must be made over again. Information must also be secured as to the charges for packing and shipping, insurance, etc., before the invoice can be completed, and the forwarders must be communicated with in order to learn the name of the ship by which the proposed shipment is to be made, and the date of her sailing. This last requirement is often the cause of much embarrassment in the case of large shipments, because foreign dealers, with the very limited space at their command, as compared with American merchants, are necessarily anxious to get the goods out of the way, and their detention even for the time required to communicate with the shipping agents in Liverpool, for example, has sometimes been found so inconvenient as to result in the adoption of the expedient of sending the cases to a storage warehouse until the necessary information could be obtained, thus involving both trouble and expense. Finally, the foreign merchant must make a personal visit, or send a properly qualified clerk, to the consular office to swear to the invoice, and thus lose several hours, probably, of valuable time. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that complaint is general and persistent among business men abroad at these burdensome regulations.

In estimating the average cost of each set of invoices at $5, you were probably much below the actual expenditure. The direct consular fees of 10s. 6d. and 2s. 6d. amount to about $3.25 for each separate invoice; and when it is remembered that the numerous distinctions of our tariff law of necessity require these invoices to be made out with unusual and excessive detail, and take into account the cost involved because of the reasons set forth above, it is probable that the total for last year's invoices would be nearer

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

five million than two million dollars as stated. That the American purchaser must ultimately pay all of this tax I think incontrovertible. Why should the foreigner pay it any more than he now pays the cost of packing or shipping, or any other expense involved in the removal of the goods which a customer has purchased? He would be short-sighted if he did, and if he pretended to do so, he would certainly have every inducement to recoup himself. But I could point to one Eastern importer whose dealings abroad have occupied a period of more than a dozen years, and have extended beyond Great Britain to France and Germany, and, to some extent, to Belgium, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries, and whose experience has been that in not a single case has the foreign merchant failed to charge upon the bill for the goods purchased the full amount of the consular fees for the certified invoices. So unquestioned has been this practice, not only in England but also on the Continent, that it may be considered sure proof that it is generally adhered to, and I believe it will be found, consequently, that the 345,007 consular invoices of the last fiscal year cost the United States importers a direct tax of about one and one-quarter million dollars.

Reverting briefly to the question whether it is good policy to attempt to support our consuls by this indirect tax laid upon a special class of citizens in the shape of fees, it may be contended that it has the objection of being a very unequal method of payment, for whereas the fees collected in some consular districts are very great in total amount, in other places they are barely sufficient to make up a respectable salary. Moreover, the temptation is always before our consuls to degrade their office and become mere collectors of fees. The fact, furthermore, that these fees for certifying to invoices are the personal perquisites of our consuls is well known abroad and unfavorably commented upon; and this, together with the tampering with the sacredness of an oath, which is manifestly involved in every certification by a consul to the correctness of an invoice of whose integrity of contents he cannot by any possibility be assured, is serving to bring our consular offices into contempt.

A. L. D.

June 20, 1893.

ENGLISH COÖPERATION IN THE PHILLIPS BROOKS HOUSE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The meeting held yesterday at Westminster Abbey "to consider the advisability of an English contribution to the American Memorial to the late Right Reverend Phillips Brooks, D.D.," was called to order at five o'clock by the Dean of Westminster. The excessive heat had made the Jerusalem Chamber, where it was to have been held, almost uninhabitable, so that the Dean and Archdeacon Farrar transferred it to the College Hall, a larger room near at hand, where the Lower House of Convocation meets. This was fortunate in every respect, because the meeting was larger than could conveniently have bestowed itself in the Jerusalem Chamber. There were upwards of sixty in attendance.

These, however, represented only a fraction of those who supported the movement, and the first feature in the proceedings was the reading of an exceedingly interesting collection of letters favoring the movement, and coming from Oxford, Cambridge, Glasgow, and elsewhere. The Bishop of Ripon (Boyd-Carpenter) telegraphed at the last moment that he was detained and could not reach London until six, and regretted that he could not "in person express the homage which he desired to pay to the memory of one so greatly gifted and so single-hearted." In much the same vein were couched letters from the Bishops of London (Temple), Winchester (Thorold), Rochester (Davidson), the Dean of Winchester (Kitchin), and Lord Playfair, who was in charge of a bill in the House of Lords while the meeting was in progress. The Master of Trinity (Butler) desired "to pay honor to the really great name of Dr. Phillips Brooks." The Bishop of Durham (Westcott) wrote that no one ever impressed him more by genial vigor and generosity of spirit; and Dr. Fairbairn, Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, spoke of Bishop Brooks as "a Bishop of the Church Catholic" whose services "made us all his debtors," and added: "However great he may have been as a preacher, he was still greater as a man, and his contribution in this respect to our modern ideal of religion was at once his noblest exposition and his apologetic for Christianity." Others belonging to Dr. Fairbairn's communion wrote in the same spirit from the Free Church College in Glasgow and the Glasgow Cathedral. These were Profs. A. B. Bruce and G. A. Smith and the Rev. G. S. Burns; the Rev. D. Macleod also wrote of his "great admiration for the noble American Bishop."

Recognition equally strong came from such laymen as Judge Thomas Hughes, the Earl of Meath, and J. M. Ludlow (a firm friend of Frederic Maurice), who was present at the meeting. Then such representative clergymen of the English Church as the Vicar of Kirkby Lonsdale (Llewellyn Davies) and the Rev. B. H. Alford of St. Luke's, Margaret Street, wrote very warmly, the latter saying: "There could not be a more appropriate place for the holding of such a meeting. I shall never forget one in the adjacent Chapter House, when America, in the person of Mr. Lowell, paid a tribute to the worth of Dean Stanley; now the admirers of the late Dean have the opportunity of doing the same by one of his best transatlantic friends." There were letters of similar purport from the Rev. Profs. Ryle, Kirkpatrick, and Mayor of Cambridge, the last of whom said that he had often read Phillips Brooks's sermons to the poor as well as to the cultivated, and he added: "They appeal to the better feelings of all."

The Bishop of Peterborough (Creighton) wrote with a very full knowledge of the special circumstances of Harvard University, and this gave a peculiar interest to his letter. After regretting that he should be out of England at the time of the meeting, he said:

"My slight knowledge of Boston gave me a very high opinion of the value of the work done by the late Bishop of Massachusetts, and my personal acquaintance with him filled me with respect for his character. My connection with Harvard College enables me to judge of the usefulness of the proposed memorial, and I shall be very glad to be associated with so excellent a scheme. Please announce me as warmly sympathizing with it."

Those who were present at the Harvard 250th anniversary in 1886 will not be surprised at these words, as they will remember the insight into the history and usefulness of Harvard College shown by the Bishop of Peterborough, who represented John Harvard's College of Emmanuel upon that occasion. A similarly sympathetic appreciation of Phillips Brooks and of Phillips Brooks House came from the Rev. Prof. Sanday, whose Bampton Lectures have just closed so impressively at Oxford. Prof. Sanday wrote:

"It was a memorable day to me when I heard Dr. Brooks preach in St. Mary's one of the most striking sermons that I have heard there. He seemed to me to combine in a degree which I have never known surpassed vigor and originality of thought with natural and unforced eloquence. I have upon my shelves several volumes which I feel sure will never lose their value for the English-speaking peoples. But these represented only a part, and not the most important part, of the activity of their author. He was without doubt one of the most prominent of the public men and Church leaders of his day. And if his fame has been in part overshadowed by that of others who were in no sense his superiors, it was, I believe, because he was cut off on the threshold of what promised to be his greatest usefulness. I cannot help expressing my pleasure that such a man should be commemorated in the way which is proposed. Harvard stands in the van of the movement with which Dr. Phillips Brooks was so closely identified for coöperation between men of different religious opinions, and the House founded in his memory will be its most appropriate centre. I greatly hope that the influence which radiates from thence may extend to the Old World as well as through the New."

During the reading of this last letter, Mr. Bryce came in, having snatched a few minutes from the debate in committee upon the Home-Rule Bill in order to testify in person to the great worth of Phillips Brooks. In a most eloquent speech, which has been much appreciated by the English public, Mr. Bryce substantially said:

"It is now 110 years since the greatest of her colonies, the great nation now called the United States of America, was politically lost to Great Britain, and for many years a feeling of resentment and animosity prevailed between the two branches of the same people. For two or three generations, the memories of the great struggle continued to exist and led to frequent friction. But at last the old ties of race and religion, literature, manners, and customs began to reassert their power, and it was realized that underlying the ostensible hostility there was a deep affection which no passing troubles could efface. Since then there had appeared at intervals men who had won respect and admiration on both sides of the Atlantic. Such men among Englishmen were Matthew Arnold and Dean Stanley, such a man on the other side of the Atlantic was Bishop Phillips Brooks."

The speech was constantly accompanied by marks of appreciation and applause from the audience. After this introduction Mr. Bryce moved: "That this meeting, recognizing in the movement for establishing Phillips Brooks House at Harvard University a result of the widespread influence, large sympathies, and active efforts of the late Bishop of Massachusetts, desires to send an English contribution in furtherance of that object." Speaking to the above resolution, Mr. Bryce gave a lucid account of the unsectarian attitude successfully taken up by Harvard, which finally took its present shape under the lead of Bishop Brooks. He referred to the frequent participation of America in tributes to great Englishmen, and urged that it was only fitting that Englishmen should join with those in America who were seeking to commemorate the most generous and enduring qualities of a great American. Having said this, the speaker sat down, and was shortly claimed by his duties in the House of Commons.

Meanwhile the Rev. Prof. Cheyne, who had come from Oxford to be present at the meeting, rose to second the resolution. He felt the greater pleasure in doing so because he could represent not his own feelings only, but also those of the late Prof. Hatch, at whose house he had met Dr. Brooks. He spoke much in the vein in which Prof. Sanday had written of the desirability of a similar

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coöperation of divergent Christian sects in England. American leaders could dare more than was possible for Englishmen in such matters. He spoke of the great hopefulness shown by Dr. Brooks, and paid the highest tribute to the eloquence of the sermon at St. Mary's referred to in Prof. Sanday's letter. Mr. J. G. Fitch of the Education Office also supported the motion, speaking of his great personal debt to the friendship of Dr. Brooks, who was the greatest spiritual force he had ever encountered. Archdeacon Farrar, who originally suggested the meeting and signed the call for it, then said, in supporting the resolution, that he never had known any man who struck him more than Bishop Brooks as a beautiful exemplification of Christian character, or who had a larger measure of hopefulness with reference to the destinies of the individual and of the nation. He was sure that a contribution from Englishmen towards a memorial of one whom the Americans so greatly loved would be another of those links which were tending more and more to bind them with their kith and kin beyond the sea. He spoke of the widespread grief upon the death of Phillips Brooks, comparing it with the national sense of loss upon the assassination of President Lincoln, and recalled with pleasure the generous contribution of Americans towards memorials in the Abbey and in St. Margaret's, Westminster.

In putting the resolution, which was unanimously carried, the Dean of Westminster confirmed the testimony last given by Archdeacon Farrar. He could not help thinking there was something very appropriate in that meeting, held as it was in a chamber built five centuries ago, long before the discovery of that land in which the late Bishop lived and labored. Americans had a special link of home association attaching to what still remained of the Old England which their expatriated ancestors left for the New World. Almost the last occasion on which they saw and heard the late Phillips Brooks at Westminster was when, a few months since, he spent an evening with the voluntary choir, and delivered one of his characteristic addresses. In publishing at the end of the meeting the lists of the American, the English, and the London Committees, with a subscription paper appended, the present writer took occasion to mention that the voluntary choir of Westminster Abbey had met a few days before and contributed £5, through their precentor, to the fund for establishing Phillips Brooks House. Contributions were announced from many sources, and a list of the London Committee of Sympathizers.

Yours very truly, LOUIS DYER.

LONDON, June 17, 1893.

THE SUNDAY LAW OF THE CHEROKEES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the general hubbub about the Chicago Sunday opening of the Exposition, it may interest your enlightened white readers to know how their civilized red neighbors have legislated concerning this much-controverted subject of Sabbath observance.

While recently examining the laws of the Cherokee Nation in a case which came before me for judicial determination, I happened to find the appended statute. Whether it was copied from some other Sunday law which has escaped my notice, I do not know; but if it is original with the Cherokees, as I believe it to be, I have no hesitation in saying that they have framed the most philosophical Sunday law that has yet been enacted. Observe its wonderful clearness, simplicity, and statesmanlike discrimination. Note how it refrains from prescribing a form or manner of observance, and from dictating to or interfering with the individual conscience; how it philosophically recognizes the fact that rest as well as work is a necessity, a condition to the well-being of mankind, and sets apart one-seventh portion of time for the general repose of society; how it also recognizes the constitutional authority of the Government as being limited to securing for the body politic merely abstention from labor; how it makes that period simply conform with the day of most general religious observance; how it excepts "works of necessity and charity," and how it is content with securing for all classes of persons "*a day of rest within the limits of the Cherokee Nation.*"

A sceptical friend suggests that this statute was "probably drawn by some missionary." Perhaps it was; but if so, I wish that Congress and our State Legislatures would employ that missionary at any cost to draw our laws for us in unmistakable terms and intelligible language.—Respectfully, etc., etc.,

CHARLES C. NOTT.

"The seventh portion of time, beginning and ending with Sunday, the first day of the week, shall be a day of rest within the limits of the Cherokee Nation; and every merchant, mechanic, artisan, or other person, who shall keep open his store, warehouse, shop, workhouse, or other place of business, or shall engage on Sunday in any manner of work, labor, or business, except only works of necessity and charity, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof before any court of competent jurisdiction, be fined in any sum not exceeding fifty dollars, for each and every such offence, at the discretion of the court." (Revised Laws of the Cherokee Nation, 1874, p. 145, §74.)

PREPARATION FOR COLLEGE IN THE CLASSICS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: If the writer of the note on Mr. Moore's translation of the 'De Oratore' meant only school-teachers by the word "pedagogue," he may have been convinced by Mr. Sherman's admirable comments in your last issue, and by his conclusion that higher powers are chiefly to blame for the extreme limitation in the number of classical authors read in our schools. Yet if he is an Eastern man, he should know that at Harvard the requirements, both in Greek and in Latin, are almost exactly what Mr. Sherman desires. In elementary Greek and Latin the candidate must be able to translate at sight simple prose and to answer questions on the usual forms and constructions of the language. In advanced Greek and Latin it is true that the authors are limited to Homer, Herodotus, Virgil, and Cicero, but here again the requirement is translation *at sight*, and the field of selection within these authors is not limited to certain books. But perhaps your reviewer, knowing all this, knew also that, even in many schools which prepare boys primarily for Harvard, the instruction in classics is confined to the "traditional books," and that the number of schools in which there is reading outside of these authors may be counted on the fingers of one hand. For such limitation there seems to be no reason save in the choice of the school-teachers. In New York State, however, from which Mr. Sherman writes, the teachers certainly have their defence in the facts that, for the Regents' examinations, there is practically no requirement in Greek or Latin at sight, and that the passages set are always taken from a very limited number of specified authors.—Yours sincerely, MERCURY.

A SLIP OF PROF. McMASTER'S.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Baedeker's 'United States,' just published, is an important work, for among American guide-books it is almost the first written wholly in the interest of the tourist. The historical sketch of the country, which is usual in books of this series, was intrusted to Mr. J. B. McMaster of the University of Pennsylvania, who makes this astounding statement on p. xliii: "McClellan began his Peninsular campaign against Richmond, was out-generalled by Lee, and, in the second battle of Bull Run, suffered so crushing a defeat that Lee ventured to cross the Potomac." The gross injustice of imposing upon McClellan responsibility for Pope's defeat (McClellan not having been allowed to take part in the battle) should be pointed out; especially as the book is for the use of foreigners who may derive from it all their knowledge of American history.

G. H. F.

PHILADELPHIA, June 27, 1893.

COLOR-SENSE IN WOMEN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your correspondent "X." inquires how the comparative freedom of women from color-blindness can be reconciled with the supposed inferiority of the sex. The satirist might reply that any superiority of color-sense in women is amply accounted for by her greater interest in ribbons and gowns; by way of reconcilement he might add that masculine proclivities are indicated by the finer sense of taste which man possesses. It is, however, to the psychologist that "X." appeals, and his answer may prove scarcely more satisfactory to her. Throughout the animal series the male varies more than the female, and this bears on the subject in two ways: in the first place the male is more brightly colored, which would carry with it a greater interest in color in the female—the peahen doubtless appreciates color better than the peacock; in the second place, the greater variability of the male holds, of course, for mental traits. Women are seldom color-blind and are never great painters. C.

GARRISON, N. Y., June 27, 1893.

WHY NOT "TYPESCRIPT"?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: While writing to a publisher yesterday, to advise him concerning a typewritten document which I had expressed to him, I half apologetically used the word "typescript." On second thought I feel almost sorry for that half apology; might we not couple "typescript" with "typewriting," on the familiar model of "manuscript" and "handwriting" (nay, more, adopt TS. as a counterpart of MS.)?

We lack some such word. A wholly Greek compound would doubtless be preferable; but all the possibilities of τύπος+γράφειν are already "pre-occupied" (as Dr. Murray would say); and, as to that, we have far worse hybrids in current use. A. ESTOCLET.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes.

A NEW 'Life of Sam Houston,' by Alfred M. Williams, editor of the Providence *Journal*, is in the press of Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

Mr. William Winter will publish, through Macmillan & Co., his 'Life and Art of Edwin Booth,' which will not form part of the series known as "Shadows of the Stage."

Lady Burton's Life of her husband, the late Sir Richard Burton, will shortly be issued by D. Appleton & Co., with illustrations and maps.

Ginn & Co. announce for the present month 'The Psychic Factors of Civilization,' by Lester F. Ward.

A bequest of Darwin's in aid of the compilation of an index to the names and authorities of all known flowering plants and their countries has now borne fruit. Sir Joseph Hooker assumed the direction of such a work, "of supreme importance to students of systematic and geographical botany, and to horticulturists," which has been executed by B. D. Jackson under the title, 'Index Kewensis.' Part i., a quarto of 728 pages, is just leaving the Clarendon Press. Part ii. is well advanced, and the fourth and final part may be expected in the course of next year. It is issued to subscribers at eight guineas (two guineas the part), through Henry Frowde, Amen Corner, London, E. C.

G. P. Putnam's Sons have issued a popular edition, in good style, of Irving's condensation of his 'Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus,' and have illustrated it with a great diversity of facsimiles of ancient prints and portraits and in other ways.

We have received Part i. of 'The Book of the Fair,' by Hubert Howe Bancroft, published in Chicago and San Francisco by the Bancroft Co. It forms a small folio of 40 pages, and the text begins with a survey of previous world's fairs, followed by a summary of the wonderful growth of Chicago. A good many irrelevant illustrations are mingled with those we might properly look for, and Mr. Bancroft's grandiloquence is freely expended in handsome typography. We cannot yet speak of the real value of this ambitious undertaking.

The title of the centre-table volume 'Gems of Colorado Scenery' (Denver: Frank S. Thayer) is no misnomer. The views are mostly picturesque, but some relate to manners and customs, industries, triumphs of engineering—like the Pike's Peak Railway or the Union Pacific "Loop" near Georgetown—the aborigines and their cliff dwellings, cowboys, coyotes, etc. The plates are good specimens of process-relief printing in varied tints. Their general attractiveness is not enhanced, to our eye, by encroachments on the margin with clever vignettes, one of which is decidedly repellent, as it shows a "road agent" "holding up" a coach.

It speaks ill for the conductors of the *Religious Herald* of Hartford, Conn., that, in presenting to their subscribers a "souvenir of fifty years' publication of the paper," they did not intimate that the gift was no novelty. In fact, their 'Picturesque Chicago and Guide to the World's Fair' is but the Baltimore publication we dispraised last week, with some differences in the illustrations. The grotesque error we pointed out, which derived the design of the ornate palace known as the New York State Building from the Van Rensselaer mansion, is retained, and emphasized by a picture of the State Building as it really is.

One can but be struck with the literary graces and the entire candor of 'Where to Go Abroad,' a guide to the watering-places and health-resorts of Europe, the Mediterranean, even of India and Bermuda (London: Adam & Charles Black; New York: Macmillan). The editor is A. R. Hope Moncrieff, and his assistants have been men of acknowledged cultivation and experience. The book seems one of the best of its kind. The Balearic Isles, which our correspondent at Palma is revealing in their exceptional loveliness, claim here but ten lines, and are evidently but little more frequented by tourists and invalids than at the time of George Sand's visit with Chopin.

Mr. Moncrieff has purposely avoided such recommendation of springs and waters as belongs to the physician. This task has been essayed by Dr. Thomas Linn in 'The Health Resorts of Europe,' a medical guide to mineral springs, climatic, mountain and seaside health resorts, milk, whey, grape, earth, mud, sand, and air cures (Appletons). Dr. T. M. Coan, who furnishes an introduction, speaks highly of Dr. Linn's competency, and we may well trust his assurance in view of his own extensive studies in the same line, especially in France, of which our columns have borne witness.

In the sense that all roads lead to Rome, all streets in Rome lead to the Pincio. It is the one spot in the Eternal City to which the thoughts of the average traveller will perhaps oftenest return—whether as in its winter garb, with the leaves off the plane trees and the white frost lying below on the Borghese gardens and afar on Monte Mario and the Janiculum, or as in summer, the band playing amid crowds from all nations, the sun setting over St. Peter's. One drawback which has hitherto been felt by some need no longer continue—a sense of painful ignorance regarding the lives and actions of so many of the men whose busts range along the terraces and are nestled among the palms and ilexes. An admirable little handbook has reached us published by Bertero, Rome, from the pen of Signor Giacomo Cortesi, 'The Silent Company of the Pincio.' It gives us the biography of the 169 great men of Italy whose busts are in the Pincian gardens. Moreover, apart from the locality, it is an easy introductory handbook to Italian history, ancient and modern. The "great and most disinterested help" of two Irish residents in Rome, Miss Tolerton and Miss Creeth, is acknowledged by the author.

A few months ago we called attention to the discontinuing of *L'Alighieri*, the Italian monthly periodical devoted to the study of Dante, and to the foundation of the new *Rivista Critica e Bibliografica della Letteratura Dantesca*, a somewhat uninviting leaflet. The latter has now suspended publication, and the publisher of the former (Olschki, Venice) announces a new periodical, the *Giornale Dantesco*, under the direction of Count Passerini, previously the editor of the *Rivista*. The new journal, which is published each month, has been promised the able assistance of Carducci, Scartazzini, and other well-known writers. The subscription price for countries outside of Italy is 22 lire.

New, also, and probably of much more value, is the *Rassegna Bibliografica della Letteratura Italiana*, published at Pisa under the thoroughly competent editorship of Prof. D'Ancona. The four numbers already received—136 large octavo pages, beautifully printed—represent the highest grade of Italian scholarship, and it is evident that if the venture becomes a permanent financial success, few students of Italian can afford to be without the compactly written summaries it furnishes of recent works dealing with Italian literature of all periods. The price of subscription is 7 lire for countries outside of Italy.

The Director-General of Italian Statistics gives notice of a forthcoming volume on the history and present condition of each Italian library.

We have received from the compiler, Mr. Aksel G. S. Josephson, Upsala, the first three parts of 'Avhandlingar ock Program, etc.'—a list of dissertations and programmes published at Swedish and Finnish colleges and universities in the years 1855–1890. The arrangement is by authors, and the break is in the midst of the letter M. Mr. Josephson has also put forth a little essay towards a bibliography of Swedish dramaturgical literature.

Dr. Max von Wolff's 'Lorenzo Valla, sein Leben und seine Werke' (Berlin: Seemann) is a typical specimen of German foresight and industry. The writings of the Italian humanists of the fifteenth century are rare, and biographical and critical literature concerning them certainly not rich. In regard to Valla, the father of modern criticism in so far as the Renaissance made modern criticism, this has been so especially the case that one reads with eagerness even an uninspired *brochure* like this, which gives nothing more than a summary of Valla's chief works and a brief account of his life. Ambitious Dr. Wolff's essay is in attempting to fill a gap by sheer force of industry; it fails, as so much German work does, through its lack of appreciation of the really vital qualities of literature. Of what use are new biographies and new commentaries unless they enter fully into the life of the period they treat, and present it to us vividly as an organic whole, seen from a single point of view?

An anonymous writer in the *Nuova Antologia* for June 1, a man, begins a series of articles on the World's Fair with a very sympathetic account of the Women's Building ("Il palazzo delle donne a Chicago"). Noticeable in the history of it is his omission to speak of its humble forerunner, the Women's Building at Philadelphia in 1876; and noticeable in the moral he draws is his dread of what may come of woman's asserting a perfect independence of man. This writer would deny her nothing in respect of the higher education, and would allow the freest scope to genius; but his fears are for the average woman and the average home. It would perhaps surprise him to learn that there are some Americans who hope there will never be another Women's Building, and who ground their belief that there will not be on the rapid effacement of sex distinctions along lines educational, industrial, and political in every State of the Union, and the growing perception that everything which pertains to mankind has an equal interest, with equal duties and responsibilities, for women and for men.

The Aspinwall family cuts a large figure in the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* for July, having a whole article to itself, besides appearing among the English wills in Mr. Waters's "Genealogical Gleanings." Here, too, we find the will of the father of George Burrough, a victim of the Salem witchcraft, that of James Goffe, brother of the regicide, and many still more important to pedigree-hunters—Breedon, Sedgwick, Coggeshall, Fouldger, Frothingham, Willoughby, Maverick, Scudder, Lippincott, De Peister, etc.

One can but welcome the revival of interest in historic studies which has led to the founding of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, a quarterly organ of the Vir-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ginia Historical Society at Richmond. This Society has just acquired new quarters and can boast a membership of 700 members. Being in the possession of many valuable MSS., and anticipating the gift of many more, it begins in the *Magazine* to publish this historical material and such other as may be found in libraries or in private hands. The Society reaches out still further in its designs, and will strive to transcribe and publish all the records in the British State Paper Office relating to the colonial history of Virginia. The first number of the *Magazine* is richly filled with the diary of Capt. John Davis of the Pennsylvania Line (May 26, 1781, to January 11, 1782), under Wayne; a first instalment of the letters of Col. William Fitzhugh, from May 15, 1679, in the library of Harvard College; proclamations of Nathaniel Bacon in 1676; a speech of Sir Wm. Berkeley, 1651; a list of Virginians in the Revolutionary navy; and the first of a series of abstracts of Virginia land patents in the office of the Register of the Land Office at Richmond, made and annotated biographically by Prof. W. G. Stanard. A sharp review of the late Douglas Campbell's 'Puritans in Holland' completes the number.

The development of the fine arts in the United States is the theme, treated pertinently to the Columbian Exposition, by Robert Koehler in *Die Kunst für Alle* of May 1 and 15 and June 1, 1893. There is an abundance of portraits and pictorial examples.

Sun and Shade for May has its usual quota and variety of photogravure plates, of which the clear portrait of the caravel *Santa Maria* at anchor in the North River is perhaps the most worthy of mention. The *Blake* is shown at full length in conjunction with her, but not in the same view.

It has just been decided in Convocation at Oxford that the University shall bear the cost of the repairs referred to in our issue of March 2 as already in process on the spire of St. Mary's Church. At the same time the choice of a design was committed to a delegacy of nine. This, it may be hoped, means the triumph of Prof. Case in his single-handed fight against the possible defacement which, in the name of restoration, has threatened the graceful beauty of the church, whose aisles still seem to the foreign visitor to be full of the spell of Newman's eloquent periods and of Matthew Arnold's no less exquisite allusion to his early preaching there. The champion of the preservation of the University church's purity of design has presented his case in a pamphlet of demy-quarto size, which will be of permanent value to lovers of the English Gothic. It is abundantly illustrated by reproductions from ancient maps and drawings, and contains, besides the history of the steeple and its pinnacles, gathered from all available documentary evidence, a discussion of the subject of Decorated Gothic in the light of a comparison with the cathedrals of Salisbury, Lichfield, and Peterborough. The pamphlet is poetically entitled 'St. Mary's Clusters,' and is published by Parker, familiarly known by his useful series of books on Gothic architecture.

— One opens the monthly magazines for July with the natural expectation of finding more or less in them about Chicago and the World's Fair. In none is this expectation disappointed. In *Scribner's*, Mr. Gibson's "Foreground and Vista at the Fair" is the first of a "group" of artists' impressions—a semi-serial which begins just as that on the poor in great cities ends, and helps to swell the serial matter to one-half the prose contents of the number. Mr. Gibson confines his impressions strictly to the artificially natural elements of beauty in the White City, which he represents in somewhat startling language "as a realization supplanting or exalting the ideal, which has hitherto not always been to the credit of heaven, . . . of the 'Heavenly City,' the 'New Jerusalem,' with gates of gold and pearl, which in one questionable shape or another hovers in the hopeful, faithful fancy of so many of the sons of Adam." Less climax-capping in its effect is Mr. Upton's account of the "Musical Societies of the United States and their Representation at the World's Fair," which, after all, has little to do with the subject indicated by the second part of its title. The most interesting article in a number that follows close on the exciting athletic contests which now appropriately mark the close of the college year, is that in which Robert Grant sketches, in the "Impressions of a Philosopher," the topsy-turvy and athletics-mad college world in which a middle-aged graduate, with an odd mixture of pride and shame, finds his son a notorious person.

—The anticipated Western note is also not absent from *Harper's*, in which Julian Ralph apologizes for an important omission in an earlier paper on Chicago. It seems that Chicago had impressed him as being a concentrate of all the "hustling" spirit of the West, an amalgam of all the sterling qualities of life and business except those into which entered the foreign element of leisure. His first conception, however, erred in taking account only of the male element, whereas it is "Chicago's Gentler Side" that alleviates the inordinate haste of the men from "a well-spring of repose." The frivolously fashionable set of Chicago is a minimum, it appears, and it is the rich and stylish set that not only lead reforms without number, but interest themselves deeply in books and art, and are personally entertaining and unconventional companions. Whether Chicago women, as a whole, are really different from those of New York or Berlin, we have, however, yet to learn. Much more distinct in portraiture and vivid in human interest is Mr. R. H. Davis's account of three English race meetings—the rowdy Derby, for costermongers and Americans; genteel Ascot, primarily for the elect; and less straight-laced Henley, for the whole boating community.

—The article on "Color in the Court of Honor at the Fair," which holds the first place in the *Century* for July, is like others of the class we have mentioned in that it deliberately excludes the deeper human interests which the Fair must necessarily excite. The author does not quite go to Mr. Gibson's extreme, presenting his subject to us as a mere earthly pageant, "in which the elements of beauty are not only infinite in number, but, as a rule, national in character." The main note of the magazine, at least so far as the non-fictitious articles go, is that of protest against Mr. Boutkine's defence some months ago of the treatment by Russia of her Jewish subjects. Mr. Joseph Jacobs, Secretary of the Russo-Jewish Committee in London, and well known there and here as a critic and the author of 'Studies in Jewish Statistics,' opens the attack in a manly fashion, giving chapter and verse for the facts on which he bases his refutation. A single point he brings forward is novel enough, and sufficiently illustrative of the new element which the science of statistics is bringing into almost all kinds of discussion, to be worth referring to here. The statistics he has collected show that "if Russia had been as tolerant to her Jewish subjects as the rest of Europe, she might have had some two hundred Jewish celebrities during the past two centuries, including three or four of the calibre of Heinrich Heine or Lord Beaconsfield." Mr. Kennan follows with a renewed demonstration of the fact that what may be very good for the Czar and the Russian Government may be very bad for the Russian people at large. Other interesting articles are not lacking. Miss Preston analyzes Thomas Hardy's art and its culmination in 'Tess of the D'Urbervilles,' regretting the presence of so marked a *Tendenz*, and condemning him for wantonly spoiling a great interpretation of woman's character by a ghastly and insufficient conclusion. Salvini contributes a new portion of his Autobiography, covering the years 1861-68; the most interesting incidents concern Victor Emanuel. Mr. Aldrich writes pleasantly on bits of Portsmouth history and legend, Mr. Gosse on Sarah Siddons, whose portrait by Gainsborough forms the frontispiece to the number, and Mrs. Oliphant on Jonathan Swift.

—The fifty thousand dollars just given to the Boston Public Library by William C. Todd forms a unique and admirable endowment. By the terms of the gift the interest of the fund is to be all annually expended for *newspapers*, to be kept in a suitable apartment in the new building, where all, citizens and strangers, can "enter freely and read." This new departure is by no means new to Mr. Todd. He began an experiment in this direction a dozen years ago in Newburyport, Mass., where he had been wont to spend much of his time, though his legal residence was Atkinson, N. H. At first he gave $300 a year to furnish newspapers in a room provided by the city. After watching for years the success of his venture, he became satisfied that he was doing good to a far greater number than by aiding libraries where he saw books with their leaves uncut for generations. So he made his Newburyport bounty a perpetuity by a fund of ten thousand dollars. Mr. Todd's munificence is unconditional, save that "in the selection of newspapers no distinction shall be made in favor of any religious sect or political party." We wish he had insisted on two distinctions—in favor of two classes of papers, namely, those printed in the most readable type and those which show the toughest paper. For want of the first condition some readers will spoil their eyes. Mr. Todd has suffered so much as to his own eyesight that it is strange he did not think of this danger. Still worse than illegible types is perishable paper. Fragility of material makes the daily issues of the press more and more like the morning cloud and early dew—"the perfume and suppliance of a minute." So crying had this evil become, that the Massachusetts Historical Society long ago proposed to require copies of such newspapers as they received to be printed on perdurable paper. It was the pride of that Society to possess 453 volumes of eighteenth-century journals. They feared that their surviving relics of the present century would be still fewer, as so many of them turn to dust themselves when one shakes the dust off them. Mr. Todd's gift adds something of credibility to Bacon's dictum: "Certainly the best works, and of greatest merit for the public, have proceeded from the unmarried or childless men; which both in affection and means have married and endowed the public."

—In the University Church of St. Mary's was given on June 4 the last of Prof. Sanday's Bampton Lectures on the "Early History and Origin of the Doctrine of Biblical Inspi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ration." In February last the lecturer opened by sketching the view taken of the New Testament by the early Church. Then followed four lectures upon the Old and two upon the New Testament. The last lecture was devoted to a retrospect, and to a presentation of such results as may be derived from a comparison of the traditional and inductive theories of inspiration. By the inductive theory, the critical view was of course designated—the one which takes its point of departure from the consideration of the individual attitudes or states of consciousness of the various writers concerned. The inspiration implied by the critical theory was, Prof. Sanday contended, quite as real and quite as fundamental as that involved in the traditional view. Moreover, it is possible to trace the links by which the generally accepted ideas of fifty years ago have passed into the modern and strictly scientific shape given to the doctrine of inspiration that is prevailing to-day. In this the measure of inspiration is not solely the consciousness of the persons inspired. We must add proofs of a higher Providence at work in the Bible which led to the committal of prophetic utterances to writing, and made occasional letters of Apostles a basis for Christian theology. Among these proofs also is the course of Messianic prophecy, and "that ordering of things by which certain books or parts of books are capable of application by analogy in senses which did not originally belong to them." There are passages in the Gospels showing supreme insight into the principles of revelation. In other passages the current view is allowed to pass unchallenged. Apart from any deeper and more strictly theological explanation of these last, it may be maintained that there is in revelation a law of parsimony by which what is suited to the capacity of any given age is alone revealed to it. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." This was the lecturer's text, and he reënforced it at this point by urging that we must expect to find some analogy between the method of God and of Christ in revelation and in the ordinary government of the world. Here he expressed a hope that Bishop Butler's argument from Analogy might continue to be the basis of English theology. Some insisted that it is a worthless argument and can prove nothing; the lecturer preferred to say that it was not an ambitious argument, and as such he valued it for the humility of mind which it implied. It would never commend itself to either sect of those who demanded "all or nothing." Those who insisted upon having all were in the position of driving a straight furrow from one end of creation to the other, heedless of what delicate growths and interlacing plants were buried and bruised under their ploughshare.

—In a discussion of certain papers recently read at a meeting of the Japan Society in London Mr. Okoshi declared that at present in Japan a wife may believe any religion she pleases, though before the abolition of the feudal system she was bound to adopt the religion of her husband. In former times a Japanese woman's property consisted only of what we should call her paraphernalia—that is, her hair-ornaments and mirrors. Now she may hold real property and solely dispose of it. She may own in her own name stocks and all kinds of securities, and, if she is left a widow, she may manage even her husband's property until one of her sons attains his majority. Mr. Okoshi further states that many Government appointments are now open to women. A paper read last April by Mr. D. Goh, on "The Family Relations in Japan," had contained the statement that there was no check to divorce except the family council. But Mr. Okoshi, replying to this, declared that, as the law now stands, if one of the parties considered the ground of the divorce unfair, he or she could appeal to the courts, which would grant the divorce only on justifiable grounds. An interesting conjecture is what influence will Japan's example have upon China. Prof. R. K. Douglas, in a lecture on "Modern Society in China," quoted in the *London and China Telegraph* of May 15, says that at present no trace of the dawn of a better day appears on the horizon of China. Woman is still regarded there as a chattel which in times of adversity may be disposed of by sale in the markets.

—Among the few linguists who have devoted special attention to the principal language of Northwestern and Central India, the Hindî, we regret to notice the death, on the 18th of May, of one of the most eminent, Mr. Frederic S. Growse of the Indian Civil Service. Mr. Growse, originally of Bildestone, Suffolk, was educated at Oxford, where he gained a scholarship in 1856. His Indian career extended from 1861 till about two years ago, when he retired, to end his days at Haslemere, in Surrey. In 1880 appeared his 'Mathura: A District Memoir,' which was followed, in 1884, by his 'Bulandshahr; or, Sketches of an Indian District, Social, Historical, and Architectural.' Both of these monographs approximate closely to ideal models of their kind. While they evince a mastery of their subjects, their tone, with respect to the natives of India, bespeaks a philanthropist—a characteristic somewhat infrequent in the writings of Englishmen when treating of their Oriental fellow-subjects. But more especially noticeable, especially to those who chiefly value literature, is Mr. Growse's English version of the 'Râmâyana' of Tulsîdâs, published in 1883. Throughout a very considerable part of India no work rivals this poem, an epic, in popular esteem. Though it dates only little more than three centuries back, what with its dialectal peculiarities, its archaisms, and its poetic licenses, it is admired mainly on pious trust by all except learned Hindus. Much on a level with such Hindus, however, was Mr. Growse, as regarded ability to solve its riddles. Nothing previously translated from the Hindî is to be compared with it in importance; and merely to say that Mr. Growse, in teaching Tulsîdâs to speak English, entitled himself to credit for skill and fidelity of a high order, is to acknowledge his merits but inadequately.

ROBERT LOWE, LORD SHERBROOKE.

Life and Letters of the Right Honourable Robert Lowe, Viscount Sherbrooke, G.C.B., D.C.L., etc., with a Memoir of Sir John Coape Sherbrooke, G.C.B., sometime Governor-General of Canada. By A. Patchett Martin. In two volumes. With portraits. Longmans, Green & Co. Pp. xvi, 411; and x, 612.

"In an age in which even the wisest and the noblest apparently deemed it their duty to burn incense on the altar of Democracy, Robert Lowe held fast to the old gods, the old creed, the old ritual. He was an aristocrat to the core—in no class signification, but in the solid and substantial sense that he believed in government by the best, and utterly disbelieved in the sagacity or superior wisdom of the crowd."

Such were the words of a London journal in an obituary of Robert Lowe, as we must still call him, for, as Macaulay says posterity has refused to call Bacon Lord Verulam, so the contemporaries of Robert Lowe will always refuse to call him Lord Sherbrooke. The obituary hits the mark. The interest of Lowe's character and career lies in this, that, being a thorough Liberal, he was a resolute opponent of democracy. A thorough Liberal he was in the old sense of the term. He heartily loved liberty and light. He paid unstinted homage to free government. He cared nothing for orthodox opinions or established systems. He clung to nothing merely because it was old. He was not only no friend to abuses, but a vehement reformer in every field on which he acted—administrative, economical, or educational—a reformer so vehement that he incurred the hatred of Conservatives, and was by them branded as a dangerous radical. An aristocrat of intellect he was, as the obituary says, and perhaps in an excessive degree; but for the aristocracy of birth he felt no respect, and if he accepted a peerage, it was with reluctance, and, as he had no children, simply as a life seat in Parliament. Yet he opposed to the death that which he took to be the principle of democracy, that every creature in human form has a natural right, and, irrespective of any qualification, a claim, to the exercise of political power. He denied that ignorance and incompetence a million times multiplied make wisdom. He contended that, in the distribution of the suffrage, the thing to be considered was not the gratification of the claimant, but the effect on the character of the governing assembly. These positions, then fast becoming obsolete, he maintained with extraordinary force of logic, fervor of eloquence, and pungency of sarcasm. That he was defeated, and that the triumphal car of democracy rolled over him, does not deprive his figure of historic interest or make us the less beholden to Mr. Patchett Martin for the industry and fairness which he has shown in the composition of this biography, whose only defect is its bulk, which may lead to a demand for a reduced version. Lowe's character has been so much misunderstood that his biographer felt it necessary in doing him justice to go into the fullest detail.

Lowe came into the world weighted with a disadvantage which only the strongest heart and brain could have overcome. He was a perfect albino. The total absence of coloring matter in his eyes made vision most painful to him. In addition to this, he had to contend with a malformation of the eye; one eye, in fact, was altogether unavailable. Albinism was in one respect a greater drawback to Lowe than blindness was to Fawcett. Fawcett's blindness excited pity, and to it he really owed his first election to Parliament; whereas Lowe's albinism rather excited ridicule and made him a butt at school. The shrinking of the eye from light gave a look of weakness to a head and face which were so far from being really weak that they were likened by an affectionate pupil to those of a Greek god. A fragment of autobiography, which every one who reads it will wish had been continued, describes the boy's struggles at Winchester, a school the authorities of which evidently walked in the ancient paths, treating the boys after the fashion of the monkish Middle Ages, mewing them up all day, giving them no breakfast till ten o'clock, and then their dinner at one. From Winchester Lowe joyfully passed to Oxford, where, notwithstanding his infirmity, he took a first-class in classics, a second in mathematics (which it was said would have been a first if he had not rubbed out with his nose the figures and diagrams which he wrote with his hand), highly distinguished himself

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a speaker in the debating club called the Union, and at the same time rowed in the University boat. He was passionately fond of study, made himself not only a good classic but a good Hebraist, and though in public he sometimes condescended to disparage classical education, in times of leisure he read classics all day long.

He married a handsome woman with some money; and an excellent wife and real helpmeet she was to him. She used to say whatever she thought—a habit which was perilous in London society and made her a mark for the archers. But she was really a woman of sense as well as of spirit. A story about the pair was current in a version which implied that Lowe despised his wife's intellect. But the true version is here given by one who was present. Lowe, in his slashing way, was criticising the Anglican marriage service, which he said was full of nonsense, making the man say to the woman, "With all my worldly goods I thee endow." "Now," he said to his wife, "when we were married, I had no worldly goods to endow you with." "Ah! but then, Robert, there were your brains." "Well, all the world knows I did not endow you with them." It was a mere joke, at which Mrs. Lowe laughed as heartily as the rest of the company.

Having taken pupils for some time at Oxford, and having tried in vain to get a professorship, Lowe took to law, though he felt he would be at a great disadvantage from his inability to see the faces of the jurors and witnesses, or even to deal readily with his own brief. Medical men threatened him with loss of sight in seven years. He thought that in seven years he might make a modest competence at a colonial bar. He went accordingly to Australia, and got a good though not the leading practice there. Among his clients was a castaway son of a high family in England, who had been sent out as a convict and had committed a murder. The murderer was taken redhanded, and Lowe could devise no plea but that of insanity or "uncontrollable impulse," which he worked with much philosophic ingenuity, but which was overruled by the unphilosophical English judge. Mr. and Mrs. Lowe took the little son and daughter of the murdered woman to their home, and brought them up at their own cost, a good deed for which, the son turning out badly, they were ill-rewarded. This is enough to prove that Lowe did not lack the milk of human kindness. He might make free of the weaknesses of humanity, but at heart he was no cynic. He had a sharp tongue, was, as has already been said, too much of an intellectual aristocrat, and was somewhat intolerant of fools.

Besides his practice at the bar, Lowe took an active part in Australian politics. He distinguished himself as a strenuous advocate for colonial self-government and an opponent of the squatter oligarchy, braving in the latter case the ire of the most powerful class in the community. For words spoken in the Legislature he was challenged to a duel, but in that case asserted his privilege. Another challenge he accepted, and went out to fight, but his adversary did not appear. How could he have managed to take aim? It was difficult to say what he could not do. Having afterwards, in his unquenchable thirst of self-improvement, learned bicyling, he was a bold bicyclist, and he would try the nerves of his friends by driving them with a pair of horses at a rattling pace through crowded streets.

Returning to England, Lowe became a writer on the *Times* and a politician. In 1856 he visited the United States and Canada. He was unfavorably impressed with American democracy, and, like Macaulay and others, came to the conclusion that it was enabled to live only because its peccant humors were drawn off by the abundance of land. He saw it at a bad moment, when the slave-owning oligarchy was still in power and the foreign mob dominated in New York. Of slavery he conceived a deep abhorrence. Chicago and its region made an immense impression on him. Of Canadian politics nothing is said, but Lowe thought that in case of war England would have at once to withdraw her army in order to prevent its being taken, and it seems that Lord Palmerston was of the same mind.

After Lowe's return came the battle with democracy. Lord Russell, a statesman of measurable capacity but immeasurable ambition, finding that the wind in his sails was dying away, and that other barques were getting the lead of him, bethought him of recurring to the original source of his reputation and proposing a further extension of the suffrage. He had tried it in 1854, but his bill, meeting with no encouragement, was withdrawn. In 1865, having become Prime Minister with Mr. Gladstone as his chief colleague, he again brought forward his measure and was defeated through a Liberal secession led by Lowe and nicknamed the Cave of Adullam. Lowe maintained that no man has an à-priori right to vote; that a man who could not raise himself by his industry and frugality to the position of a ten-pound householder (the existing qualification) was not fit for the exercise of political power; that the ability and character of the House of Commons would not be raised but lowered by the change, and that this was decisive of the question. The following passage shows the ground on which he stood and on which all Liberal opposition to universal suffrage must stand:

"When the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that the *onus probandi* lay with his adversary in this instance, he must have meant that anterior to the existence of society there was vested in every man some personal à-priori right which nobody had authority to touch. When Mr. Mill, in like manner, speaks of every citizen of a State having a perfect right to a share in its government, he appeals to some à-priori considerations, in accordance with which every man would be entitled, not only to be well governed, but to take part in governing himself. But where are those à-priori rights to be found? The answer to that question would lead me into a metaphysical inquiry which I shall not now pursue, contenting myself with saying that I see no proof of their existence, and that the use of the term arises by the use of a bungling metaphor, by which a term appropriate to the rights arising under civil society is transferred to moral considerations antecedent to it. Can those alleged rights form a ground on which a practical deliberative assembly like the House of Commons can arrive at a practical conclusion? If they do in reality exist, they are as much the property of the Australian savage and the Hottentot of the Cape as of the educated and refined Englishman. Those who uphold this doctrine must apply it to the lowest as well as to the highest grades of civilization, claiming for it the same universal, absolute, and unbending force as an axiom of pure mathematics. A man, according to the theory of which I am speaking, derives a right of this kind from God, and if society infringe it, he is entitled to resist that infraction. He is judge without appeal in a cause over which no human tribunal has jurisdiction; he is executioner as well as judge, and so this seemingly harmless dream puts the dagger into the hand of the assassin. Those abstract rights are constantly invoked for the destruction of society and the overthrow of government, but they never can be successfully invoked as a foundation on which society and government may securely rest."

Among the special points made by Lowe were the dangerous tendency of the working classes to combine in a class interest, and the increased control which railways and the telegraph had given to constituencies over their representatives. The speeches told amazingly, thunders of applause rolled round the Conservative benches, and the Russell-Gladstone Government fell. But what was the sequel? Mr. Disraeli, having got into power, brought forward a measure of suffrage extension even more sweeping than that of Lord Russell and Mr. Gladstone, his idea being that, while the intelligent mechanic would be a Liberal, the residuum, as the dregs of the people were euphemistically styled, would be Tory. This bill also Lowe opposed, and used the same arguments with equal force, but in vain. This time the Conservatives, instead of cheering, sat mute under party discipline, and voted for the bill. It was said that Lowe wept. It is certain that he gave free vent to his indignation. "I was told the other night," he said, "by the Honorable Member for Elgin Boroughs, that the fates and destiny had been too strong for me. I have no fear of them, sir; what has been too strong for me is the shabbiness, the meanness, and the littleness that here met together." He might, however, have drawn comfort, though rather of a dismal kind, from the reflection that if a body of English gentlemen, men of property and education, could thus, under the influence of party, vote against their declared and deepest convictions, the political world would hardly be much the worse for being handed over to American democrats or representatives of the British working class. The late Lord Derby, then Lord Stanley, a paragon of cultivated intelligence and heir to a very ancient earldom and a million of dollars a year, had most explicitly pledged himself that if the Russell-Gladstone Bill were thrown out, no similar measure should be brought in by his party. Yet as soon as the exigencies of party required him to break that pledge, the pledge was broken.

Prof. Jowett, in a "personal memoir" of Lord Sherbrooke appended to this Life, seems to agree with the Member for Elgin Boroughs in thinking that Lowe was vainly struggling against the current of destiny. But so far as the advance of democracy, or at least the extension of the suffrage, in England was concerned, Lowe could have given this a conclusive answer. Nothing is more certain than that the revival of the suffrage question was in the first instance the offspring of Lord Russell's personal ambition. There was no general demand for it, and when Lord Russell's first bill proved abortive and was withdrawn, hardly a murmur of regret was heard. It is equally certain that, after the defeat of his second bill, the country would have been perfectly content to see the subject drop if Mr. Disraeli had not been ambitious of settling the question, and settling it, as he thought, in the interest of his party, by the enfranchisement of the lowest class of voters. To personal ambition, therefore, or to party tactics, not to destiny or any other occult influence, is to be ascribed the progress of Parliamentary democracy in England; nor was Lowe, in opposing it, fighting against heaven or fate, but against powers of a far less august and less invincible kind.

Lowe afterwards came into a Liberal Cabinet and distinguished himself by his industry as an administrative improver and reformer. But he was resolute in rejecting what he thought sham reforms, and a keen dissector of the fallacies which underlay them. A certain Mr. Tupp having called his attention to some

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

papers and lectures on bimetallism, Lord Sherbrooke replies:

"I have read Mr. Gibbs, so need not trouble you, and I have had the advantage of a lecture from Mr. Cernuschi himself. I congratulate you on your discovery of the philosopher's stone. If *saying* that one metal *shall* be equal in value to another can make it equal, you are fairly entitled to claim to have discovered the secret of boundless riches. But why bimetallism only? Why not trimetallism, or quadrimetallism? It is as easy to *say* that copper is equal to gold as silver."

Disraeli's Reform Bill gave a member to the University of London, which did itself the honor of electing Lowe. Disraeli, afterwards, taunting Lowe with his supposed unpopularity, said that he had provided him with a seat, which he could not have found anywhere else in the country. It is justly remarked by Lowe's biographer that Disraeli could hardly have passed a severer judgment on his own measure than by saying that, after its enactment, there was only one constituency in the country by which such an intelligence as that of Lowe, united with such independence of mind and zeal in the public service, could hope to be elected.

Lowe was a most brilliant talker, and the flow of his wit was perfectly spontaneous. Those who listened to Macaulay, Sydney Smith, Sir David Dundas, Rogers, Hayward, or Bishop Wilberforce could not help feeling that they more or less talked for display, or at least with a consciousness that they were talking to appreciative hearers. But Lowe's mind gave out the electric spark to anybody who touched it, and he was just as likely to say a capital thing to you sitting alone with him in his study or by his side on the driving-box as when he was amidst a party of leaders of society and wits. Some of the sparks are preserved in these volumes, but they are few compared with those that have been lost in the night of oblivion.

PIERCE'S LIFE OF SUMNER.—I.

Memoirs and Letters of Charles Sumner. By Edward L. Pierce. Vols. III., IV. Boston: Roberts Bros. 1893.

FOR these concluding volumes of Mr. Pierce's 'Life of Sumner' we have waited fifteen years, but the fulness of the text and the rich abundance of the notes account for the delay, which still we must regret because so many who admired Sumner's character and were devoted to his fortunes are already gone. With full admiration for Sumner, Mr. Pierce has written no panegyric, no apology. While the interpretation of his opinions and his conduct is always sympathetic, there is a good deal of honest difference from his political beliefs and of quiet reprehension of his conduct and his speech. There are constructions here that will excite indignant opposition; but that Mr. Pierce has endeavored to judge Sumner and his friends and enemies fairly does not admit of doubt. His style is simple, vigorous, and compact. The various summaries of events and estimates of individuals and the conclusions of important passages of history are written with peculiar force and skill.

In these volumes Mr. Pierce had a much larger subject than in the two volumes which appeared in 1877: there an ardent and aspiring youth, much travelled and with troops of friends, and finally the hero of a memorable Fourth of July oration; here one of the most conspicuous figures in the political anti-slavery resistance to pro-slavery aggression. The treatment of the two periods is not so disproportionate as at first appears, for the two final volumes contain 1,279 pages and the two first only 783. But it is still disproportionate, and if Mr. Pierce had made his book at one cast, the first volumes would have been much reduced. The last are truly biographical—historical only so far as was necessary to give the proper setting of the personal career. The arrangement of the matter in these is much better than in the former volumes. There the correspondence was massed at the end of one chapter after another. Here it is assimilated to the narrative, and is much less abundant, though much more important, than before. It is so good that we are always wishing that there might be more; for Sumner's letters have a directness and simplicity which his speeches and orations often lack.

But Mr. Pierce has done better than preserve the right proportions between biography and history. He has preserved the right proportion between Sumner and the other political champions of the anti-slavery cause. Wilson was so generous with Sumner always that Sumner's biographer could not be less than generous with him; but he is not less so with Giddings, with Charles Francis Adams, and with Chase. He has not found it necessary to depreciate others in order to make Sumner's height preëminent. He deals, indeed, very sternly with Conkling and Fish; and if Seward's friends do not take serious exception to his treatment of that statesman, we shall be much surprised. But they will find it very hard to break the force of Mr. Pierce's allegations. The contrast afforded by the subtlety of Seward's character and the simplicity of Sumner's could not have been more vivid if Mr. Pierce had kept it consciously in view.

The new instalment opens with a chapter on society in Boston as it was in 1845, when Sumner was thirty-four years old. The picture is well painted, but does not attract, because it is the picture of a society that was narrow, formal, self-conscious, pedantic, with much of that gravity which has been defined as "a mysterious carriage of the body invented to conceal the defects of the mind"; a society "despotic over individual thought, insisting on uniformities of belief in matters which were related to its interests, and frowning at novelties which struck at its prestige." This was the society, devoted to Winthrop and Webster, against which Sumner had to make his way. It is evident that he had much in common with it always, and that made it all the harder for him when it shut its doors on him. The courage which his break with it displayed must not be measured by his actual loss, which was not great, but by the exaggerated estimate of it which his sensibility insured.

Taking the lecture field in the winter of 1845-'46, Sumner awakened an interest and admiration that were to serve him well a little further on. A profound seriousness was the chief characteristic. Devoid of humor, the lack was less injurious than it would have been in a less serious time. His Phi Beta Kappa address at Cambridge won for him many golden opinions, and gave bonds for his increasing interest in philanthropic work. His lecture on "White Slavery in the Barbary States" was not such a far cry that its echoes did not reach the apologists for American slavery in their comfortable security. Immediately there were suggestions of ambition and self-seeking, and Dr. George Putnam wrote to him that they were in the air. Sumner's elaborate reply is a complete *apologia pro vita sua* as it appeared to him in 1848. His sincerity in disclaiming all political ambition cannot be impeached. His interest in the slavery question began, he wrote, in 1835, and the *Liberator* was the first paper for which he subscribed "when Wendell Phillips was still indifferent." But Phillips got on much faster when once he had begun. That the first political meeting which Sumner attended was in 1845 shows not only his disinclination to politics, but the feebleness of his anti-slavery convictions up to that time.

Mr. Pierce devotes an entire chapter to the prison-discipline debates in Tremont Temple in 1846-7. He does not exaggerate their importance, for they brought Sumner squarely into conflict with the conservatism of Boston; they planted many a root of bitterness along his path; they gave him his first taste of the joy of battle, which he found so sweet that the political arena took on a more inviting aspect than it had had before. His first political speech was also his first speech against slavery, November 4, 1845, in Faneuil Hall, where the "Conscience Whigs" had come together to protest against the admission of Texas as a slave State, Charles Francis Adams, the natural leader of the movement, being in the chair. With the beginning of the Mexican war in the ensuing spring, Sumner found himself engaged in a conflict with Mr. Winthrop as lively as any on the Rio Grande. It was a conflict which very greatly embittered the conservative mind of Boston against Sumner. Mr. Pierce has gone to the verge of an apology for him in his endeavor to do ample justice to his opponent. It was a stern indictment that he brought: "Through *you* they [the people of Boston] are made *to declare unjust and cowardly war, with superadded falsehood, in the cause of slavery.*" But that it was correctly drawn, the most conciliatory of Mr. Pierce's phrases does not in the least disguise. That Sumner could not understand why Mr. Winthrop should be personally aggrieved by his attack, and was himself much hurt by his anger, was a very characteristic circumstance. It marked his painful lack of humor and his extreme sensibility to the good opinion of his fellow-men. Without keeping this sensibility in mind it is impossible to appreciate the courage with which he invited animosities that were sure to bring him almost intolerable pain. So easily stung by censure and so happy in the approval of his fellow-men, it is greatly to his credit, as Mr. Pierce has written, "that he never swerved a hair's breadth from duty to win the praise or to escape the blame." One incident of his conflict with Winthrop was his nomination against him by the bolting Whigs. He refused the nomination, in serene unconsciousness that he was irretrievably committed to a political career.

Nothing was more significant of Sumner's standing while as yet he held no office than the way in which Giddings turned to him for sympathy and advice. Already in 1848 Sumner looked to the formation of a new party as the only anti-slavery hope. His hopes for the Free-Soil ticket of that year were absurd; nor less so was his forecast, after the election, of the future of the Democratic party. It was the successful party that first met its doom. Sumner as a Congressional candidate received only one-third as many votes as Winthrop, but his acceptance of the nomination was a surrender, not without qualms and scruples further on, of his resolve to take no political office. It was a wise surrender, for neither in literature nor in law could he have achieved anything commensurate with his political career. Routed in the open field, and impatient to make themselves felt in national legislation, the Free-Soilers resorted to a series of coalitions to se-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cure their end. One of these made Chase a Senator from Ohio and another made Sumner a Senator from Massachusetts. As a prelude to that event Mr. Pierce has an admirable chapter on the Compromise of 1850. It may be commended especially to those who are just discovering that really nothing was the matter with Webster's 7th of March speech. It was Sumner's speech against the compromise that made him the candidate of the Free-Soil and Democratic coalition. Those who would be very glad to have a fold of Sumner's mantle to cover the nakedness of their political shame assure us that here was "a deal" in which he was an active worker on his own behalf. Mr. Pierce's account of the whole matter is a piece of elaborate candor, and it leaves Sumner's part in it without a stain. He gave no pledges, he made no concessions, and he entered on the office an absolutely independent man.

This was in December, 1851, and it was not until August, 1852, that he made an opportunity to open his mind freely on the Fugitive-Slave Law. The delay was painful to his friends, but all misunderstandings vanished in the light of the accomplished speech. That and the speech entitled "The Crime against Kansas" and that entitled "The Barbarism of Slavery" were Sumner's three great speeches before the appeal to arms. They were conspicuously the speeches of a scholar in politics. The moral sentiment was always genuine, but the rhetoric was less than absolutely real, and their force was often broken by great shoals of quoted passages in which some pride of scholarship unquestionably mingled with the orator's resolve to fortify his case. But Sumner knew well that he was addressing not so much the Senate as the whole country, and the terrible indictments to which the Senate, for the most part, listened with real or feigned indifference, were read with passionate enthusiasm by thousands of anti-slavery people in the North, and added many to their ranks. The splendor of his most famous speeches has involved his average Senatorial work in an impenetrable shade for the more casual observer; but Mr. Pierce, without seeking to establish a foregone conclusion, brings ample evidence that his supreme efforts by no means exhausted his entire capacity. There was no changing aspect of the slavery question that escaped his vigilance, and, had he no other laurels than those won by his anti-slavery speech and action, his fame would be sufficiently assured. But Mr. Pierce's pages are convincing that no Senator had more conscience for the general legislative work or contributed more liberally to so much of it as was apart from his peculiar line. At the same time the feeling is not to be escaped that Sumner in the Senate was like the poet's star, and dwelt apart. His ways were not those of the other Senators nor his thoughts their thoughts. He was isolated by his character, his culture, and by the radical position he assumed at each succeeding stage of the long fight with slavery and the evils it entailed. His strength was that of the impassioned moralist, not that of the constitutional lawyer, or the adroit debater, or the parliamentary tactician. His appeal was much oftener to the Declaration of Independence than to the Constitution, which in each emergency was like the Mormon prophet's compass: "When I had taken it in my hand, it did turn whichever way I would." To say that nothing could be constitutional which was not right smacked of the pulpit, not of the Senate; but it marked the purely moral character of Sumner's anti-slavery position. It was this which loaded all the dice against him when the fatal throw was made.

Mr. Pierce has treated no other part of Sumner's life with so much elaboration as that pertaining to the assault on him by Preston Brooks. His object is to show that there was so much connivance in the act, and so much excuse and justification offered for it in the subsequent investigation, that Brooks must be regarded as merely the tool of the pro-slavery party. Sumner so regarded him, and never spoke of him unkindly. Both Sumner and his biographer are completely justified by the evidence adduced. Sumner's language was exasperating and his taste in parts deplorable; but Brooks cared for neither except so far as it served as an excuse for his brutality. It was well that some one should meet the pro-slavery Senators with a pride as lofty and a scorn as bitter as their own. It was their first vivid intimation that the day of compromise and concession was drawing to an end. It hastened the inevitable catastrophe. So did the barbarous assault, for it was the staple of Republican speeches in the campaign of 1856. Bleeding Sumner appealed to the Northern voter more powerfully than "bleeding Kansas." His absence from the Senate, barring a few vain attempts to renew his service, was extended through four years. Meantime his empty seat was not less eloquent than his voice had been before. He returned to find the compromising temper of his party growing steadily with the approach of victory. His "Barbarism of Slavery," delivered in June, 1860, appealed to the political abolitionists within the party lines and braced them for the fearful trial of their faith a few months further on, when the fool's motley of compromise was wellnigh the only wear.

Mr. Pierce has treated Sumner's sickness and convalescence as carefully as his fatal speech and the assault. It must be said that during much of his stay abroad Sumner subjected himself to a social strain that would have broken down the perfect health of any ordinary man. The horrible treatment which he suffered at the hands of Dr. Brown-Séquard, wholly peculiar to himself, may have assisted his recovery. Mr. Pierce is more sceptical than Sumner about this. It is certain that it induced the first attack of the disease, *angina pectoris*, to which he finally succumbed.

Napoleon, Warrior and Ruler, and the Military Supremacy of Revolutionary France. By William O'Connor Morris. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1893. Pp. xvii, 433.

THIS is the latest volume in the "Heroes of the Nations" series. It would be strange indeed if any nation could permanently canonize the great destroyer of nations, and Mr. Morris rather mournfully admits that modern France loves neither Napoleon nor his family. Nevertheless, he regrets what he calls "the preponderance of defamation since the disastrous war of 1870-71." He admits Lanfrey's "clever fragment" to the privilege of examination, but characterizes the author as "the only libeller of Napoleon who has tried to rise to the level of history." Taine is accorded a primacy among "these slanderers," and is then summarily sentenced as a "minute philosopher of calumny." After this, it is not surprising to find that Mr. Morris approaches the great Corsican with reverence and admiration. He remarks in the preface that "the most trustworthy judgments" about Napoleon were formed by "the generation of writers which flourished between 1830 and 1860." As we go on, this phrase appears to mean that Mr. Morris will repeat the verdicts of Thiers's specious 'History of the Consulate and Empire,' a work which is the literary apotheosis of chauvinism. The judgment of scholarship has been recorded against the artful flatteries and patriotic misrepresentations of Thiers. Such a student and critic as Lanfrey may not be easily dismissed with a reference to the fluctuations of public opinion. Mr. Morris should at least remember that the hostility to the Bourbons in the middle of this century may have been no less pervasive in influence than the reaction against the Napoleonic legend in the days of Gambetta and Sedan.

Mr. Morris meets the "slanderers," Lanfrey and Taine, with what he calls the "simple answer of history." This is, in brief, that "Napoleon could never have risen to the heights he reached, could never have done the work he did, could never have acquired his prodigious authority and influence, had he been a monster of selfishness, of meanness, of lust, of wickedness." Undoubtedly this answer is too "simple" to be the complete and final reply of the muse: That men in whom selfishness and lustfulness were predominant qualities "*have* acquired prodigious authority and influence," is an undeniable fact, and their sins have not always found them out so speedily as did Napoleon's. Rodrigo Borgia died in Peter's chair. Catharine II. was one of the makers of the Russian empire. Talleyrand, more capable of momentary generosity than Napoleon, was also a far greater adept in duplicity, more coldly relentless, more despicable in meanness; and, at the Congress of Vienna, Talleyrand conquered the coalition that had overthrown Napoleon at Waterloo. Moreover, Mr. Morris gives no fair version of the indictment brought by Napoleon's enemies. That marvellous etching which Taine elaborated with such painstaking does not represent the great Corsican as only a "monster," as a mere compound of inhuman selfishness and debauchery. Perhaps the acid is sometimes too mordant. Napoleon was more than a mediæval captain of a free company, more even than a resurrected Cæsar Borgia; but Taine, after all, does not lose sight of the projectile power by which Napoleon was launched forth. It was the complex evolution of Jacobinism that made Napoleon possible, and that "red fool fury" is Taine's chief and ultimate enemy.

From Napoleon's Commentaries and Correspondence the author has sought to extract the secret of the Emperor's personality, and, indeed, the circumstances of composition and publication have rendered those works more interesting to the psychologist than to the historian. In the Commentaries is revealed Napoleon the warrior, and it is that character which has apparently fascinated Mr. Morris. He cannot withhold his admiration for the fact of splendid conquest, although he looks hesitatingly at the awful price paid for victory, at the blight cast by military supremacy upon both law and culture, at the inevitable reaction against changes wrought by autocratic violence. Of the various campaigns of the modern master of the art of war Mr. Morris has evidently been a careful and enthusiastic student. He has certainly produced a complete and orderly condensation of Napoleon's military and diplomatic policy. The current of the story runs both rapidly and clearly, and the pages of the volume are richly furnished with maps. It is a pity, however, that these maps should be so indistinct and chary of necessary detail. As illustrations of the text, there is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scarcely one of them that can compare with the maps in Mr. John C. Ropes's recent volume of lectures upon 'The First Napoleon.'

Such, then, were the purposes and equipment with which this rapid portraiture of Napoleon was attempted. The author sketches his outline liberally: "Napoleon was a universal genius; great as a ruler, greatest as a warrior." Down to the rupture of the peace with England in 1803, but little shade is thrown into the picture. Napoleon is treated as the saviour of France and the predestined hero of the Revolution, answering the despairing call of Sieyès for "a brain and a sword." After 1803 the scene changes, for Mr. Morris discerns a Napoleon spoiled by success. The Emperor is no longer "one of the ablest and most successful of rulers"; he has become "the uncontrolled despot, subjugating and bestriding the Continent," the enemy of the civilized world. Mr. Morris finds excuses for the murder of the Duc d'Enghien, and yet admits that the slaughtered Bourbon "sits heavily upon Napoleon's memory." After Austerlitz, Napoleon's rule became "a scheme of oppression leading to universal conquest." The Continental system and the daring plans at Tilsit for the subjugation of the world betray "no trace of the wisdom of Napoleon's youth"; they are "a reckless scheme of mere brute force." After a fitting reference to Napoleon's burglary in Spain, Mr. Morris exclaims: "Nemesis was waiting in grim repose for her victim; the Son of the Morning was ere long to fall." The utter failure of Napoleon's strategy and public policy during the Russian campaign is attributed to the natural decay of an absolute despot's powers and to the inherent weakness of a "despotism of the sword." "Prometheus," we are told, "in vain defies the word of Zeus; Genius contends in vain against supreme fact; the ministers of vengeance reach their victim." In Germany the reforms introduced with French supremacy were "more than effaced by the innumerable wrongs, iniquities, and miseries caused by it." In France the Senate and Legislature were "a mere herd of flatterers"; judicial independence was "weakened"; the ministers of Napoleon were only mechanical registers of the autocratic will; taxation was "oppressive" and levied "by illegitimate means." The conscription had stripped the country districts; the Continental System had ruined the coast towns from Hamburg to Marseilles. The people heard of the birth of Napoleon's son "with indifference"; they did not lament the Emperor's downfall. On the contrary, "raving multitudes" denounced and assailed him as he journeyed to Elba. Barring a few allusions to "Prometheus" and "the Son of the Morning," Mr. Morris has here repeated the accusations of those "slanderers" whom, at the outset, he rather ostentatiously repudiated. We read that Napoleon "had the despot's dislike of all that deals with man on his moral side or with the free growth of human ideas." "The insatiable conqueror" is no longer "the armed champion of the French Revolution," as he had been before 1803. He is now described as "the greatest of despots, mocking at truth when he calls himself 'the Messiah of a popular Gospel.'"

The average reader is likely to be puzzled if he tries to form a consistent idea of Napoleon from Mr. Morris's brilliant narrative. He will find no adequate reason why the patriotic general of the Republic should have shortly become the cold-blooded despot of the Empire. The author has dexterously interwoven the faint dispraise of Thiers and the deep damnation of Taine, but he has failed to blend the two views into a coherent whole. The year 1803 witnessed no change in the man Napoleon, although it may have witnessed a development in his public policy; but that evolution was the result of an altered opportunity, not of an altered character. The confusion in Mr. Morris's presentation is mainly due to failure to grasp, first, the relation of the Revolution to the army which the Revolution had created, and, second, the relation of the man Napoleon to the essence of the Revolution. In a moment of reconstruction, the army, always a despotic instrument, seemed to Cæsar and to Napoleon a proper organ of government; to Washington it was not so. Military supremacy, then as now, stifled the breath of democracy. Founded upon that military supremacy, the Napoleonic régime was the antithesis of the French Revolution. Napoleon himself, youth and man, an inspired soldier, inordinately ambitious, superbly intellectual, unimpressionable, pitilessly self-contained, and pitifully self-restricted, despised the democratic idea, and from the beginning hoped to overthrow it. When, in the hour of peril, some one advised him to call "the People to arms," he answered: "I have destroyed the Revolution, and how can I call on it?" This continuous quality of the real Napoleon Mr. Morris seems to see, but he obscures the vision of Napoleon's innermost personality with the superficial theory of a "dividing line" in the Emperor's public policy. He ventures once upon the amazing assertion that Napoleon "had a deep sense of the divine"—a riddle hard to read in connection with the man who could dismiss the horrors of the Beresina in this fashion: "After all, what has this cost me? Three hundred thousand men, among whom, indeed, were many Germans." Was it really an ideal of the divine to which this Titan sacrificed three millions of lives and uncounted treasure?

The Emancipation of Women and its Probable Consequences. By Adele Crepaz. With a letter to the authoress by the Right. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1893.

It is fortunate for the fame of the great Liberal leader that it is in no danger of being affected by the literary commendations which he is in the habit of dispensing so generously. In the present instance, he seems to us to have been peculiarly unfortunate, inasmuch as he not only has been excessive in the degree of his praise, but has selected as the special excellence of the book in question the very quality in which it is conspicuously deficient. "To save us from this danger [of rash action]," says Mr. Gladstone, "what we want is *thorough* treatment, and you have given it the most thorough treatment which I have yet seen applied to it." In point of fact, such merit as the book possesses lies entirely in the repetition of the familiar predictions as to the probable consequences of the opening of all fields of activity to women; the emotional efficacy of these predictions being occasionally rendered quite considerable by vivid and earnest presentation. Whatever force considerations such as these may properly exercise on our judgment, the mere reiteration of predictions can hardly lay claim to the character of a thorough discussion; and we are constrained to infer that what Mr. Gladstone had in mind was the evidences adduced by the authoress in the shape of facts of the present day as throwing light upon what we might expect in the coming time. But anything weaker and less able to stand examination than the portions of the book in which this is attempted has seldom come to our notice. Not only does the authoress commit the favorite error of the advocate of a cause—whether it be protection or bimetallism or the single tax—of pointing out evils and calmly assuming that they are due to the agency against which he is contending, and thus begging the question; not only does she contentedly infer *propter hoc* from *post hoc*, but it is impossible to understand considerable portions of her book without supposing that even from *ante hoc* follows *propter hoc*. For surely in Germany the emancipation ideas have, apart from certain very limited circles, not yet passed beyond the realm of speculation; and yet we are given a sad picture of the state of things there (pp. 91–96), as though they were a result of the movement for the higher education of women.

In the one case in which the best opportunity existed of studying the effect of altered ideals, the case of America, Frau Crepaz contents herself with the wildest and crudest assertions. Some idea of the value of her observations on this head may be obtained from the circumstance that the one statement concerning the relations between the sexes in America which she considers so important as to demand italics is that "It is well known that *the happiest marriages in America are those contracted between American men and German women*" (p. 26). After this, we need not be surprised when we are given to understand (pp. 77 and 78) that American mothers seldom take part in the education of their own children; or that "a marriage of reason is the only one she [the woman of the Northern States] thinks of." Along with this nonchalant dealing with broad generalities, goes naturally the most careless handling of specific facts, so that we find *Florence* Blackwell (p. 43) and Elizabeth *Anthony* Stanton (p. 13); while the few statistical statements made (*e. g.*, p. 28 and p. 84) are so vague as to be quite worthless. In short, as we said at the outset, if the book has any value, it is simply what it has in common with every warning that the emancipation of women may bring on evils greater than those that it cures; its reasoning is of too loose a texture to be of any assistance in the understanding of the question, and it totally fails to utilize such light as might be thrown upon it by the actual experience of America and England.

The Great Book Collectors. By Charles Isaac Elton and Mary Augusta Elton. London: Kegan Paul; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1893.

Whether this volume is more entertaining or instructive may be an open question. It appeals in either case to a small class, and to others its learning will seem of little worth and its entertainment sparse. In truth, gossip, the chief source of amusement in book-lore, as in other fields, will not thrive within the narrow limits of two hundred pages, but demands such freedom as is found in the crowded leaves of many-volumed Dibdin. Yet the authors have, with much diligence, collected a store of information that to most book-lovers will be new or forgot, nor have they neglected to interweave abundance of quaint anecdotes. To us the earlier pages, devoted to collectors of manuscripts in the days before type, have most charm, perchance because most unfamiliar. Here we find an extremely early enunciation of the common law of property in books. St. Columba, having copied St. Finnen's Psalter without leave, King Diarmid decided against

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him in the resulting suit, on the ground "that to every mother-book belongs the child-book, as to the cow belongs her calf." St. Columba, we may add, brought an appeal in the higher court of battle, where the decision was reversed by the defeat of Diarmid. We find a hint for the Library Association in the versified catalogue of the library at York, compiled by Alcuin. Let us have the A. L. A. Catalogue in verse—short metre with an alexandrine now and then for an uncondensable title; between New York and St. Louis it could easily be done. We have no space to linger over the books of Richard de Bury, Duke Humphrey, Petrarch, Poggio, and Corvinus, or those of Cotton, Harley, Bodley, Grolier, or Naudé. The last-named, for his time, had a very pretty notion of a public library. Here is the first rule of the Mazarin Library: "The library is to be open to all the world without the exception of any living soul; readers will be supplied chairs and writing-materials, and the attendants will fetch all books required in any language or department of learning, and will change them as often as is necessary."

The publisher has dressed the book, which is one of the series of "Books About Books," in pleasant type and rough-edged paper of dull surface. He has adorned it with several plates showing bindings and manuscripts, and four or five reproductions of excellent old portraits. Being of English make, the leaves of course start up when it is opened, like so many locks of Traddles's hair; and nothing less ponderous than the "International" will keep it open at a given place. There is an index.

Histoire Générale du IV. siècle à nos jours. Ouvrage publié sous la direction de MM. Ernest Lavisse et Alfred Rambaud. Tome Ier: Les Origines. 395-1095. Paris: A. Colin & Cie. 1893. L. 8vo, pp. vi, 805.

CERTAINLY the Genius of universal history, now long domiciled in Germany, aweary of watching the deliberate, interminable progress of Oncken's 'Allgemeine Geschichte,' must have refreshed herself between *Lieferungen* by a trip to Paris. The volume above cited is the first of twelve wherein writers of repute, authorities concerning the several epochs, are to review the history of the more important peoples down to the present time. It takes up the tale, not with man before the mammoth, as the title might in these days seem to hint, but with the fourth century of our era. Doubtless many will find it an encouragement to have got so far before beginning.

M. Berthelot, who supplies more than a third of the volume, opens it with an account of the political and social condition of the Roman Empire and the German tribes at the time of the great invasion. From his hand, too, are the chapters on the various Germanic kingdoms, and the history of the Franks through the reign of Charles the Great down to the accession of Charles the Fat. The rise of the Capetians and the origin of the kingdom of France is described by MM. Langlois and Luchaire, while the development of Germany and the revival of the empire is treated by M. Charles Bayet, who has also written two valuable chapters on the Eastern Empire. M. Lavisse, in that nervous style which would make a less interesting subject attractive, sketches the evolution of the papal power. The history of Britain is by M. Bémont, that of the Slavs and other Eastern Europeans by M. Denis, while M. Maurice Wahl writes on Mohammedanism and the caliphates of the East and West.

It need hardly be said that the editors have planned the work wisely and skilfully, and have taken great care with the arrangement of the material which they have obtained. Their first thought has been for the proper presentation of the social organization, the changing character of the peoples. Wars and courts have everywhere taken the background. The chapters are judiciously subdivided and dates are freely given. Thus, with the use of titles in bold-faced type at the beginning of paragraphs which introduce a change of subject, the book is made handy for reference and pleasant to read. There are few notes, and these explanatory, but at the end of each chapter is a brief bibliography which names and comments upon the sources of the narrative and the principal books upon the period. Reference is also made to more detailed bibliographies where such exist. We note the omission of Hodgkin's 'Italy and her Invaders' from the scanty list of books upon the Ostrogoths and Lombards. Gibbon, too, is surely still worthy of mention.

The work promises to be honorable to French historiography. It is based upon the results of thorough research, and is expressed with all the lucidity and sense of proportion which we have grown used to call French. The volume itself is evidence of this spirit: the type is agreeable, the page well chosen; the book is large without being big, close-packed without being bulky. Some of the future volumes will be 'Feudal Europe and the Crusades,' 'The Hundred Years' War,' 'The Renaissance and Reform,' 'The Wars of Religion,' 'The Epoch of Louis XIV.,' etc. It is clear that later events are to be treated at greater length. While one volume suffices for 400 to 1100, 1100 to 1900 requires eleven. A just sense of proportion demands no less; and yet, looking at such trim chronological perspectives, where the centuries diminish in apparent extent like ties upon a railroad track, we sometimes wonder who shall make us really believe that more generations of men passed over the earth between the time of Augustus and the Norman Conquest than have been counted from the Conquest to this day; that years were as long under Clovis as under Cleveland, and ran no fewer to the fifth century than to the nineteenth.

The work will appear in *livraisons* of 80 to 100 pages (at one franc each), at the rate of two a month.

The Birth and Development of Ornament. By F. Edward Hulme, F.L.S., F.S.A. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: Macmillan. 1893.

ANY one who should look in Mr. Hulme's 'Birth and Development of Ornament' for a continuous thread of development, or for nice discrimination of styles or coherent analysis of any style, would be disappointed; but he would find an outline of the history of art, a good many interesting facts, apposite or inapposite, some exploded theories and statements, and some judicious criticism. Mr. Hulme's point of view is what is sometimes called insular—that is, his authorities are English, his ideas are English, and English examples take a larger share of attention than their relative importance demands. But he covers a wide range, and the artistic sense and knowledge which he has shown in his more technical books do not desert him here. The list of Landmarks of History which he has brought in at the end would be valuable if they were real landmarks; but the lack of perspective which characterizes the book is seen here also, and the items seem to be picked up at random. The building of the Parthenon, the Norman Conquest, and the beginning of St. Peter's are landmarks; the birth and death of Grinling Gibbons, the establishment of the Lowestoft potteries, and the death of Welby Pugin are not.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Bishop, W. H. A House-Hunter in Europe. Harpers. $1.50.
Blyth, A. W. Lectures on Sanitary Law. Macmillan. $2.50.
Brackett, Anna C. Woman and the Higher Education. Harpers. $1.
Burnham, Lieut. W. P. Duties of Outposts and Manual of Guard Duty, U. S. Army. Syracuse, N. Y.: C. W. Bardeen.
Cahoon, Haryot H. What One Woman Thinks. Tait, Sons & Co. $1.25.
Chinnock, E. J. Arrian's Anabasis of Alexander, and Indica. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan. $1.50.
Clifford, Mrs. W. K. Mrs. Keith's Crime. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
Conklin, B. Y. Practical Lessons in Language. American Book Co. 35 cents.
Crawford, F. M. Pietro Ghisleri. Macmillan. $1.
Creevey, Caroline A. Recreations in Botany. Harpers. $1.50.
Cruttwell, Rev. C. T. A Literary History of Early Christianity. 2 vols. Scribners. $6.
Doyle, A. Conan. The Refugees: A Tale of Two Continents. Harpers. $1.75.
Dumas, A. Six Years Later. M. J. Ivers & Co. 25 cents.
Foote, A. R., and Everett, C. E. The Law of Incorporated Companies Operating under Municipal Franchises. 3 vols. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. $15.
Freeman, E. A. History of Federal Government in Greece and Italy. 2d ed. Macmillan. $3.75.
Fuller, Jane G. Hearts and Coronets. Robert Bonner's Sons. $1.
Gibson, Margaret D. How the Codex was Found. Macmillan. $1.50.
Hudson's Dictionary of Minneapolis. Minneapolis: H. B. Hudson. 25 cents.
Hurlbut, Ella C. Mrs. Clift-Crosby's Niece. Tait, Sons & Co. $1.
Littell's Living Age. April—June, 1893. Boston: Littell & Co.
Lowell, J. R. Conversations on Some of the Old Poets. Philadelphia: David McKay.
Migula, Dr. W. An Introduction to Practical Bacteriology. London: Sonnenschein; New York: Macmillan. $1.60.
Miller, C. G. Donn Piatt: His Work and His Ways. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. $1.50.
Millison, D. G. How it Happened: The Story of Milton's Paradise Lost. Wichita, Kan.: Beacon Publishing Co.
Moncrieff, A. R. H. Where to Go Abroad. London: A. & C. Black; New York: Macmillan. $1.25.
Murphy, J. J. Natural Selection and Spiritual Freedom. Macmillan. $1.25.
Murray, J. A. H. A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Part VII. Consignificant—Crouching. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan.
Needell, Mrs. J. H. Lucia, Hugh, and Another. Appletons. $1.
Newcomer, Prof. A. G. A Practical Course in English Composition. Boston: Ginn & Co. 90 cents.
Newhall, C. S. The Shrubs of Northeastern America. Putnams. $2.50.
Nisbet, John. British Forest Trees and their Sylvicultural Characteristics and Treatment. Macmillan. $2.50.
Palgrave, R. H. I. Dictionary of Political Economy. Part Fifth. De Cardenas—Drawing. Macmillan. $1.
Pepper, Dr. William. A Text-Book of the Theory and Practice of Medicine by American Teachers. Vol. I. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders. $5.
Peterson, Dr. Frederick. In the Shade of Ygdrasil. Putnams. $1.
Piatt, Donn. Poems and Plays. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. $1.50.
Piatt, Donn. Sunday Meditations and Selected Prose Sketches. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. $1.50.
Picturesque Chicago and Guide to the World's Fair. Hartford: D. S. Moseley.
Pond, S. W. Two Volunteer Missionaries among the Dakotas. Boston: Congregational Publishing Society. $1.25.
Post, W. K. Harvard Stories: Sketches of the Undergraduate. Putnams. $1.25.
Quain's Elements of Anatomy. Vol. III. Part I. The Spinal Cord and Brain. 10th ed. Longmans, Green & Co. $4.
Rawnsley, H. D. Valete: Tennyson, and Other Memorial Poems. Glasgow: James MacLehose & Sons; New York: Macmillan. $2.
Riddle, A. G. Ansel's Cave: A Story of Early Life in the Western Reserve. Cleveland: Burrows Bros. Co. $1.25.
Roberts, Ellen. One of Earth's Daughters. Boston: *Arena* Publishing Co.
Russell, Raymond. Asleep and Awake. Chicago: C. H. Kerr & Co. $1.
Scott, Sir Walter. Ivanhoe. [Dryburgh Edition.] Macmillan. $1.25.
Scudder, S. H. Brief Guide to the Commoner Butterflies of the Northern United States and Canada. Henry Holt & Co. $1.25.
Scudder, S. H. The Life of a Butterfly. Henry Holt & Co. $1.
Shipley, Arthur E. Zoölogy of the Invertebrata: A Text-Book for Students. London: A. & C. Black; New York: Macmillan. $6.25.
Southworth, Mrs. E. D. E. N. Retribution. M. J. Ivers & Co. 25 cents.
Stebbing, Rev. T. R. R. A History of Crustacea. [International Scientific Series.] Appletons. $2.
Stories of the South. Scribners. 50 cents.
Strong, Rev. Josiah. The New Era; or, The Coming Kingdom. Baker & Taylor Co. $1.50.
Tavistock Tales. Tait, Sons & Co. $1.25.
Temple, Sir Richard. James Thomason. [Rulers of India.] Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. $1.
The Adventures of Uncle Jeremiah and Family at the Great Fair. Chicago: Laird & Lee. 25 cents.
The Maxims and Reflections of Goethe. Macmillan. $1.25.
Woman's Mission: A Series of Congress Papers on the Philanthropic Work of Women. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co.; New York: Scribners. $3.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED